This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

25355
HN 4SPY 2

KF 25355

Samuel P. Warren.

No.

"Reader, if haply thou art blessed with a moderate collection, be shy of showing it; or if thy heart overfloweth to lend them, lend thy books; but let it be to such a one as S. T. C.—he will return them (generally anticipating the time appointed) with usury; enriched with annotations tripling their value."

an
1.00

Portrait of Philidor inserted.

A few LARGE PAPER copies have been printed on French vellum paper (*Papier vélin d'Annonay,*) on Dutch laid paper (*Papier vergé de Hollande,*) and on American toned paper.

Two copies have been printed on

VELLUM:

THE FIRST BOOK-PRINTING ON VELLUM EXECUTED IN AMERICA.

A. D. Philidor.

blished May 1st 1819 by I & J. Allman, Prince's Street, Hanover Square, London.

THE

LIFE OF PHILIDOR

MUSICIAN AND CHESS-PLAYER

BY

GEORGE ALLEN
Greek Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Pennſylvania

WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY ESSAY ON

PHILIDOR

AS CHESS-AUTHOR AND CHESS-PLAYER

BY

TASSILO VON HEYDEBRAND UND DER LASA
Envoy Extraordinary and Miniſter Plenipotentiary of the King of Pruſſia at the Court of Saxe-Weimar

PHILADELPHIA
E. H. BUTLER & CO.
LONDON C. J. SKEET *PARIS* G. BOSSANGE & CIE
LEIPZIG ERNST SCHÄFER
1863

KF 25355

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1863,

BY GEORGE ALLEN,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PHILADELPHIA:

CAXTON PRESS OF C. SHERMAN, SON & CO.

PREFACE.

THE ſpecial and indiſpenſable original ſources of information for the life of Philidor are the following:—I. A biographical notice in the work of his pupil, La Borde (*Eſſai ſur la Muſique*, 4 vols. 4to. Paris 1760.) This notice was baſed on memoranda furniſhed by Philidor himſelf, rather over fifteen years before his death; but it brings his *perſonal* hiſtory down no lower than 1754, the date of his return from England.—II. The "*Anecdotes of Mr. Philidor, communicated by himſelf*" in *Cheſs* [by Richard Twiſs, F.R.S.] vol. i. 1787, pp. 149–71, with the additional anecdotes in *Cheſs*, vol. ii. 1789, pp. 215–18, and the "*Cloſure of the account of Mr. Philidor*," in Twiſs's *Miſcellanies*, 1805, vol. ii. pp. 105–14. Theſe anecdotes, while they confirm the notice of La Borde, are far more copious, and conſtitute the chief reliance of the biographer.—III. The article *Philidor peint par lui-même*, in the ſeventh volume of Saint-Amant's *Palamède*, (pp. 2–16,) compoſed by J. Lardin from matter prepared by Philidor's eldeſt ſon, André, who ſurvived until 1845. It embraces a biographical notice, which the ſon had completed, and a number of random anecdotes. The notice contains little beyond what appears to have been derived from Twiſs's *Cheſs*;

but the anecdotes, worthleſs as a portion of them may be, are of peculiar intereſt and value, for the light which they throw upon Philidor's perſonal character and habits.—IV. A ſpecimen of the letters which Philidor was in the habit of writing home, during his annual viſits to London. Theſe important documents are found in the *Palamède* for 1847, pp. 172–8.

Now many Lives of Philidor have been written, in the ſhape of articles in works of general and ſpecial Biography; but they differ ſingularly from each other, in reference to the uſe made in them of the above-deſcribed original authorities. Of courſe, none but ſuch as have been written ſince 1847 could exhibit anything derived from the matter furniſhed in Saint-Amant's *Palamède*. But of the others—and they are nearly all—it is a curious fact, that none but ſuch as have been written by Cheſs-authors (and I might even ſay by *Engliſh* Cheſs-authors) have ſhewn any knowledge whatever of the *Anecdotes* of Twiſs. Hence Mr. George Walker's very agreeable *Biographical Sketch* (prefixed to his edition of the *Analyſis*, in 1832) and the appropriate chapter in Mr. Tomlinſon's delightful *Amuſements in Cheſs*, both baſed upon Twiſs, are by far the beſt of all that appeared before André Philidor's poſthumous notice. As to *French* Cheſs-authors, all they have of Twiſs has been obtained at ſecond hand: the ſlight and inaccurate *Biographie*, for example, in the firſt volume of La Bourdonnais's *Palamède*—the production, moſt likely, of the lazy and careleſs "King of the Cheſs-board" himſelf—is made up from the *Biographical Sketch* of Mr. Walker; and the brief notice in the Comte de Baſterot's moſt attractive *Nouveau Traité élémentaire* appears to be baſed directly upon the correſponding chapter in the *Amuſements* of Mr. Tomlinſon.

As for the numerous lives of Philidor, written by

other than Chefs-authors—articles in Encyclopædias, Biographical Dictionaries, and Dictionaries of Muſical Hiſtory and Biography—theſe, whether French or Engliſh, are, for the moſt part, mere tracings after the ſketch of La Borde, with only ſo much of unauthentic anecdote or goſſip, as each writer might happen to pick up from caſual ſources of information. Of theſe, that which was contributed to the *Biographie Univerſelle* of the Brothers Michaud, by Sévelinges, is not merely defective, like the reſt, but poſitively miſchievous: it contains that calumnious charge of plagiariſm, which has been regularly copied by the ſecond-rate compilers, who have ſtolen their materials from that vaſt quarry. The very able article on Philidor, in M. Fétis's *Biographie Univerſelle des Muſiciens*, for its ſingular merits and its very original defects, ſtands entirely by itſelf. It is unique in the value of its criticiſm of Philidor's muſical works—made, as it was, after careful ſtudy of the engraved ſcores, now ſo little known and ſo difficult to procure; and it is triumphant in its vindication of the probity, as well as of the genius, of Philidor. On the other hand, it is equally unique as a piece of perſonal biography. Fétis knew nothing of Twiſs, and he wrote before André Philidor. Although a Chefs-player himſelf, and a frequenter of the *Café de la Régence*, he appears never to have read, or to have treated with contempt, the *Biographie* of La Bourdonnais's *Palamède*. Nothing was left him, therefore, but La Borde; and La Borde he regarded with a ſcorn ſo intolerant and ſo abſolute, that he would not accept as ſatisfactory even thoſe particulars of Philidor's foreign reſidence, which at the ſame moment he tells us were contributed by Philidor himſelf. Nay, when he finds the German, Gerber, repeating thoſe ſame particulars, and ſubſtantiating them by independent teſtimony, he as little ſcruples to ſmother Gerber, as to throw overboard La Borde. To ſupply the lack of per-

ſonal details, of which he thus robs himſelf, he is forced to fill up his ſketch with La Régence goſſip; and this, where it is, in its way, injurious to Philidor, has been unfortunately and unſuſpectingly copied by the muſical writers, who naturally defer to the high authority of Fétis—ſuch as Adam, Scudo, and Pougin.

From that which I have thus, with all freedom, ſaid of my predeceſſors, it may be ſufficiently inferred, what I have myſelf aimed to make the Life of Philidor now preſented to the Reader. It might, perhaps, have been more what it ſhould be, if it had not been originally, like its fellows, a mere *article*—the fruit, too, of accidental authorſhip in the field of my recreations, rather than in that of my profeſſional ſtudies. The truth is, that, having ſucceeded in collecting a remarkable Cheſs-library—now one of the five or ſix in exiſtence, that approach completeneſs—I was induced, in 1857–8, more readily than I could have ſuppoſed poſſible, to contribute to the *American Cheſs Monthly*, (which had then juſt been eſtabliſhed by the able bibliographer and philologiſt, Mr. DANIEL W. FISKE,) a ſeries of articles on the perſonal biography of Philidor, of which fifty copies were ſeparately printed for private diſtribution. The reception of my biography, in either form, by the Cheſs-world, to which alone it was then addreſſed, was ſo unexpectedly favourable,* that, when my illuſtrious correſpondent, Herr VON DER LASA, offered to contribute a ſupplementary paper on *Philidor as Cheſs-author and*

* The celebrated French Cheſs-*littérateurs*, MM. DOAZAN and ST.-ELME LE DUC, in particular, made a moſt graceful recognition of what I had endeavoured to do for the memory of their great countryman, by publicly inſcribing to me—the former his charmingly written monographs entitled *La Bourdonnais-Morphy* and *M. Alliey*, the latter a beautiful article in *La Régence* on his precious Ceylon Cheſs-board; and the learned German Maſter, Herr MAX LANGE, did me the honour to preſent a free verſion of my Biography to his countrymen, (with praiſe far beyond its deſerts,) in the *Schachzeitung*.

Chefs-player, I decided at once—quite contrary to my original intention—to give the work a careful revifion, and to publifh it in the ordinary mode.

To be perfectly frank, however, I muft own, that my decifion was not a little affected alfo by the temptation to indulge certain philobiblian taftes of mine, long fuppreffed but profoundly inveterate. Laying to my foul the flattering unction, that better Grecians than I had been bitten with the *Bibliomania*—that Brunck, for example, (who was a gentleman and a foldier, before he was a fcholar,) never put forth one of his editions without having copies printed on Large Paper and at leaft one for himfelf on Vellum—I accepted it as a good reafon for publifhing my own trifling volume, that I fhould thereby have the opportunity of "inaugurating" book-printing on Vellum in America.* The fuppofed difficulty of the undertaking gave it the charm of an adventure. From Dibdin—with whofe pages I had often dallied too fondly—I had learned, that the Engliſh experiments of his day, although made by a Bulmer, had been decided failures, the caufe of which lay (as he believed) in the bad quality of the imported material. With entire confidence in the fkill of our Philadelphia preffmen, I was equally fure, that the relations of my friends, Meffrs. JOHN PENINGTON & SON, to the honourable houfe of HECTOR BOSSANGE & C^ie^ at Paris would fecure me the beft vellum to be had anywhere. Nor was I difappointed. M. BOSSANGE Senior—ever ready to oblige his American

* In mercy to future Panzers and Van Praets, I will reconcile beforehand fome apparent conflict of dates by ftating precifely, that after the work had been carried on into the laft fheet of the Life proper in 1859, it was fufpended; and that, before it was refumed, (viz., in the fpring of 1860,) two copies of another little book of mine (the *Novena to St. Antony of Padua*, pp. viii and 1–24,) were printed on Vellum in the fame Office; while Mr. GEORGE LIVERMORE, of Boſton, had three Vellum-copies of the *Souldiers Pocket Bible* (pp. viii and 1–16) executed by Mr. Houghton, of the Riverfide Preſs, Cambridge.

clientèle—not only cauſed the ſkins to be examined and ſelected by an *expert*, but alſo forwarded me, from the ſame ſource, full and minute inſtructions for the guidance of the preſſman—the want of which was the *real* cauſe, I ſuſpect, of the failure of Bulmer. With ſuch ample preparations and precautions, the work has been executed with entire ſucceſs.

I have only to ſtate, in concluſion, that I have been induced, by the conſideration that but few take any intereſt in Bibliography, to detach from the Life of Philidor the original Appendix on the editions of the *Analyſe*. This *Bibliotheca Philidoriana* will, however, be ſpeedily printed by itſelf, with many corrections and additions.

G. A.

PHILADELPHIA, June 13th, 1863.

[*Prefixed to the private edition of* 1858.]

TO

DANIEL WILLARD FISKE, Esq.,

EDITOR OF THE CHESS MONTHLY.

My dear Fiske,

To no one, with ſo much propriety as to you, could this poor attempt at Cheſs-biography, in its preſent form, be inſcribed, for it has been yours from the beginning. You led the way to it, by your own beautiful lives of Guſtavus Selenus and of Domenico Ponziani. It was written *for* you—to relieve you from ſome portion of your editorial labours, during your abſorbing engagements with that Firſt American Cheſs-Congreſs, whereof you were, at every ſtage, ſo large a part. And when I appealed to the good-nature of our common friend, Mr. Miller, to allow me the troubleſome favour of a ſeparate impreſſion, what I had chiefly in view was the opportunity, by dedicating it to you, of expreſſing how highly I eſtimated the value of your ſervices in the cauſe of American Cheſs and of American Cheſs-literature. I muſt add, however, that as the work began to reach its concluſion, an additional motive for ſuch collective impreſſion began to force itſelf upon my mind. I reflected,

that there ſtill remained many unpubliſhed letters of Philidor—that there ſtill ſurvived many recollections and traditions, by which ſome of his opinions, ſome of the events of his life, and the circumſtances of his ſolitary death and burial might be cleared up; and I ventured to indulge the hope, that the private diſtribution of my papers, in a collected form, among ſome of the Cheſs-literati of France and England, might operate as a direct appeal to them to ſecure the publication of ſuch additional materials before it ſhould yet be too late. Even if diſappointed in this hope, I ſhall not regret having joined you, my dear Fiſke, in the attempt to record the perſonal hiſtory of the Cheſs-heroes of other lands and of other times. The work is at leaſt a pious one; and, as ſuch, may be deſtined, perhaps, to an appropriate reward:—ſome foreign author, of a happier inſpiration than mine, may one day ariſe to embalm the career of *our* Cheſs-hero in a record as laſting, as that which has preſerved forever the memory of Lionardo da Cutri and Paolo Boi of Syracuſe. The diſtant adventure, upon which the youthful PAUL MORPHY has gone forth, is not leſs chivalrous, than thoſe which won for that earlier IL PUTTINO the title of the *Cheſs Knight-errant*:—may he too find his Aleſſandro Salvio; and thus, by a double title, ſhine to poſterity not the leaſt brilliant among the "LIGHTS AND SPLENDOURS OF THE GAME OF CHESS!"

I remain, MY DEAR FISKE,
Your friend and coadjutor,
GEO. ALLEN.

PHILADELPHIA, Auguſt 2d, 1858.

THE

LIFE OF PHILIDOR.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY YEARS—MUSIC AND CHESS.

IN the early part of the ſeventeenth century, an Italian hautboy-player, from Sienna, by the name of *Filidori*, viſited France, and produced a ſtrong impreſſion on the mind of Louis XIII. by his brilliant performance. Meanwhile a young ſubject of the King's, Michel Danican* by name, had been ſtudying the ſame inſtrument, in his native Dauphiné, with ſuch ſucceſs, that his ſkill went far beyond

* If the royaliſt general, Auguſte Danican, was really (as Quérard affirms) of the ſame ſtock as Philidor, (even if not his ſon,) and if the new *Biographie Générale* be correct in ſaying that the General was of a decayed *noble* family, then either a *nom de fief* may have been dropt, or the actual name may have been ſpelt originally with the ariſtocratic *de*, viz., *D'Anican*.

anything until then known in France. He, too, came to Paris, a few years after the viſit of the admired Italian; and when he had been admitted to play before the Court, his powerful inſtrument ſo ſtirred up in the ſoul of the King the recollection of his "ſweeteſt of muſicians," that he exclaimed—"*I have recovered my Filidori . . . I have found a ſecond Philidor!*" The *ſobriquet* of PHILIDOR, beſtowed under circumſtances ſo impreſſive, remained ever after inſeparably attached to Michel Danican and his numerous ſucceſſors. He himſelf was immediately made muſician of the royal Chapel; his ſon, of the ſame name, (born in 1635,) was likewiſe hautboy-player, both in the Chapel and in the King's private band; and the race of Philidors, always multiplying and always clinging to the profeſſion of their Dauphinais progenitor, (for one even beat the kettle-drum, for lack of talent to compaſs any higher attainment,)* had, by and by, come to form a large element in the compoſition of the King's muſical eſtabliſhment.†

The third‡ Michel Danican, after having long

* "Le ſecond était Tymbalier des Menus-plaiſirs, n'ayant jamais pu parvenir à faire autre chose." *La Borde.*

† The facts given by La Borde and Twiſs have here received ſome ſlight addition and interpretation from Fétis.

‡ La Borde, Twiſs, André Philidor, and Lardin all agree in making Philidor's father to have been the *ſecond*, and not the *third*, Michel—

filled the poſt of baſſoon-player to Louis XIV., was permitted by Louis XV., in 1724, to retire on a penſion. He fixed himſelf at Dreux, near Paris; and there FRANÇOIS-ANDRÉ DANICAN-PHILIDOR was born, on the 7th day of September, 1726.* He was the firſt ſon by a third wife,—a woman (ſays her deſcendant) of a character ſingularly unſophiſticated and ſimple. Theſe qualities were reproduced in her ſon, in a proportion as remarkable as his ſhare in the muſical endowment of his race.† At the age of

---

to have been the *ſon*, and not the *grandſon*, of the Dauphinais hautboy-player. I believe them all to be in the wrong, and that Fétis (whom I follow) is in the right, partly becauſe he appears to have conſulted authentic documents, and partly for other reaſons, which will preſently appear.

* Here Fétis gives the date of 1727, upon the authority of the valuable MSS. of Beffara, (*Biographie des Muſiciens*, art. BEFFARA.) But M. Fétis appears to have ſeen the engraved portrait by Bartolozzi, and might have reflected, that the date attached to it was moſt probably given upon the authority of Philidor himſelf; and *we* have (what Fétis had not) not only the teſtimony of Twiſs's Anecdotes, but alſo the legal certificate, (*acte de naiſſance*,) which Lardin profeſſes to have had in his hands.

† The other biographers make her a ſecond wife. I follow Lardin, who alſo (as a proof, perhaps, of her extreme ſimplicity) makes her at nineteen marry a huſband of ſeventy-three. He gives our hero, at his birth, a ſiſter of fifty-ſix years old; and will have him to be one of *eight* children, born between 1726 and 1730, when his father died—a period of only four years. Such an account, although coming from a deſcendant, is clearly not to be relied upon. According to Fétis, Philidor's father, Michel the third, was but fifty at the time of his laſt

ſix, after the death of his father, André was admitted one of the Pages of the royal Chapel, at Verſailles, and was thus put, for his muſical education, under the veteran Campra, who was both *Maître de Chapelle* and alſo, by ſpecial patent, Teacher of the Pages. This admiſſion was four years earlier than the age preſcribed by the rules of the Chapel. The favour was, therefore, probably due to the influence of his numerous relations in the King's ſervice, and to the ſupport which their repreſentations derived from evidences of his extraordinary precocity of muſical talent, and of his docility of diſpoſition. His boyiſh treble could be made available at once; and his literary ſtudies* were probably made to keep even pace with his exerciſes in Harmony and Counterpoint. The rigid old Campra was not at all the

marriage. The other biographers, as we have ſeen, aſſume his father to have been the ſecond Michel; and this, probably, is the ſecret of the bridegroom's advanced age.

* Nothing is ſaid, in my authorities, of Philidor's literary education; but I aſſume it to have been received under Campra's ſuperintendence, becauſe I underſtand, (from Grétry's *Mémoires* and other ſources,) that the *Maîtriſes* (or reſidences of the *Maîtres de Muſique*) of Cathedrals—and *à fortiori* of a Chapel Royal—were complete *Schools*, in which (as in the *Conſervatories* of Italy) the pupils were lodged and ſtrictly looked after, while they were carefully taught, along with their profeſſion, whatever was neceſſarily aſſociated with it. Some knowledge of *Latin*—the language of the Church ſervices, which formed the uſual theme of compoſition—appears, therefore, to have formed part of Philidor's education as a Page.

man to ſpoil a pupil by letting him graſp too ſoon at the reputation of being a muſical prodigy. When, therefore, he allowed a Motett, with grand choruſes —the compoſition of the boy-page, at the age of eleven years—to be performed in the royal Chapel, before the King himſelf, he gave the ſtrongeſt poſſible teſtimony to the genius of Philidor, to his remarkable precocity, and to the thoroughneſs of his early attainments in muſical ſcience. The King encouraged the talent and rewarded the proficiency of the young Page—who ſeems to have won everybody's love and eſteem from boyhood upwards—by kindly complimenting him and adding a preſent of five *louis*.* The boy perſevered in his ſtudies, and wrote four Motetts more. At length, when he had completed his muſical education, and when the age of fourteen had put an end to his pageſhip, he left the royal Chapel, and began to ſupport himſelf in Paris by copying muſic, and by giving leſſons to a few pupils. "This (ſays Twiſs) was in 1740, when ſeveral *Motetts* of his compoſition were

* It is Fétis who informs us of the ten-year rule. He, therefore, will not admit that Philidor became a Page until 1737. Campra would not, he ſays, allow a boy to produce a Motett, when he had been ſtudying only one year. This is no doubt true. But M. Fétis, inſtead of inferring, that Philidor might poſſibly have been admitted earlier than ſtrict rule allowed, prefers to infer that the Motett was never written. André Philidor makes the Motett to have been written at twelve, and the King's preſent to have been ten *louis*.

performed at Paris at the *Concert Spirituel*, which were favourably received by the public as the productions of a child, who was already a Maſter and Teacher of Muſic."

But the profeſſional activity of young Philidor began now to be interfered with by that faſcinating purſuit, which he was never willing to acknowledge as anything for him but a ſecondary object at beſt, but to which he owes his permanent reputation. He had already learned Cheſs while attached to the royal Chapel. The Kings of France, in thoſe days, heard Maſs with muſic every morning. The time during which eighty muſicians waited, near the Sanctuary, for the King's approach and the beginning of Maſs, muſt have hung heavily enough upon their hands; and ſome means of amuſement were conſiderately allowed them. Cards were forbidden; but a long table, inlaid with ſix Cheſs-boards, was provided—by the higher intellects (we muſt preſume) of the muſical corps. It was in ſuch ſacred proximities, from muſicians waiting to accompany with voice and inſtrument the Holy Sacrifice, that Philidor learned Cheſs.* When he left the Chapel

* So much, and no more, ſay La Borde and Twiſs. But André Philidor tells us the following ſtory: "Philidor had often looked over the board with attention, but without ever playing himſelf, when, one morning, an old muſician, who had come to his poſt rather early, grumbled a little at having nobody there to play his game of Cheſs

he had the reputation of being the beſt player in the band; and he may have flattered himſelf, that this reputation was worth ſomething, ſo long as he frequented only ſuch of the numerous *Cafés*, wherein

---

with. The boy, with modeſt heſitation, offered himſelf to do what he could. Such an offer, from a boy under ten, ſeemed ridiculous enough, but was merrily accepted. As the game went on, the laughter changed to wonder, and the wonder to wrath. The boy watched the darkening of the cloud, and accompanied the approach of checkmate with ſuch a gradual ſliding along towards the end of the bench, that when the ſtorm burſt he was able to reach the door too ſoon for the old limbs of the 'enraged muſician.' The next day there was a ſcramble for the honour of playing with the 'marvellous boy.'" I believe this ſtory to be true, in ſpite of my fixed diſtruſt of André's accuracy, becauſe it is perfectly true to nature—true to the talent and curioſity of the gifted boy, and true to the poſition of deferential inferiority, in which lads of ten were kept, before *La jeune France* and *Young America* had come into faſhion. It is, beſides, preciſely what occurred in the caſe of my venerable colleague, Profeſſor Vethake, the Provoſt of our Univerſity. Mr. Vethake's father, while playing daily with a neighbor, had obſerved that his ſon, then only nine years old, ſeemed to look over the board with ſingular attention. He, therefore, ſaid to him, one day, "Henry, you appear to take great intereſt in Cheſs—I think I muſt teach you the game." "But, Papa, I know the game already." "Why, who has taught you?" "Nobody; I have learnt it by ſeeing you play." "Sit down, then, and try a game with me." The boy took his place at the board to play his firſt game, and filial piety did not prevent him from beating his father ſoundly. His ſecond game—or a very early one, at any rate—was played againſt a learned and ſkilful, but choleric, Dutch gentleman, who anſwered the boy's *Checkmate*, by knocking him down with the board. Of Profeſſor Vethake's later career as a Cheſs-player I have ſaid ſomething in a Letter on *Cheſs in Philadelphia*, contributed to the *Book of the Congreſs*.

Cheſs was played, as have left no name behind. But, by and by, his good fortune guided his ſteps to the immortal CAFÉ DE LA RÉGENCE, and ſeated him oppoſite to quite another player than had graced any of the ſix ſacred boards. M. de Kermur, Sire de Légal,* at that time about forty years old, reigned ſupreme in that famous *Café*, and was undoubtedly a player of extraordinary ſtrength; for Philidor alone was ever able to beat him, and that, too, not until he had developed his entire force by playing with Sir Abraham Janſſen and the Syrian Stamma.† The "firſt player of the band" found it neceſſary to accept the Rook from M. de Légal; and it took full three years to work his way up, through the various degrees of odds, to the honour of confronting his maſter, on even terms, as a "firſt-rate."‡

* This great player's name is variouſly written *Kermur*, *Sire de Legalle*, by Twiſs, and *Kermur* and *Kermuy*, *Sire de Légal*, by others. In the Liſt of Subſcribers to Philidor's ſecond edition it ſtands as in Twiſs, but the ſpelling was, probably, in both caſes Philidor's own. The account of Légal, given in the *London Magazine* for May, 1825, I take to be one of thoſe fictions, under the garb of hiſtory, which have infeſted Cheſs-literature ſtill more vexatiouſly ſince the days of the wretched La Bourdonnais and Méry *Palamède*. Diderot calls him "le profond," and adds, "on peut être homme d'eſprit et grand joueur d'échecs, comme Légal." (St. Amant's *Palamède*, t. ii. p. 88.)

† Fétis ſays that old Cheſs-players at the *Café de la Régence* had repeated to him Philidor's own ſtatement, that he did not attain his full ſtrength until he had made his campaigns in Holland and in England.

‡ Philidor's communications to Twiſs ſhow that he received odds,

At this ſtage of his progreſs, the power of playing blindfold was diſcovered to exiſt in Philidor; and in the utter ignorance, on everybody's part, of what had been done in that way by the Paladins of the great Italian School, a hundred and fifty years before, the ſenſation excited by the young prodigy's feats was like that with which Paganini electrified the world, in the days of my "fair and ſhining youth."* M. de Légal, it ſeems, had once tried, when young, to play a ſingle game blindfold, but found himſelf ſo abſolutely exhauſted that he never repeated the experiment.† It now occurred to him, to aſk Philidor, one day, "Whether he had ever tried to play from

for three years, from his maſter, but they do not ſpecify the gradation. That he received the Rook at firſt is an old *La Régence* tradition, and is probably true. La Bourdonnais uſed to take the Rook from Captain Harry Wilſon, a player certainly far inferior to Légal. Deſchapelles alone, if we are willing to be of the few or none that believe his famous ſtory, roſe to the rank of a firſt-rate, in twenty-four hours, without ever receiving odds of any kind.

* [Or like that, (I may now add,) which has been made, in the ſociety of London and Paris, during the laſt ſeaſon, by the *eight* ſimultaneous blindfold games of PAUL MORPHY.]

† See Diderot's account of his converſation with Légal (then nearly eighty years old) in reference to Philidor's blindfold exhibitions in London, (St. Amant's *Palamède*, t. vii. p. 180.) I cite the words of Diderot's letter (April 10, 1782). "Au reſte, j'en ai parlé a Monſieur de Légal; et voici ſa réponſe: 'Quand j'étais jeune je m'aviſai de jouer une ſeule partie d'Echecs ſans avoir les yeux ſur le Damier; et à la fin de cette partie, je me trouvai la tête ſi fatiguée, que ce fut la première et la dernière fois de ma vie.'"

memory, without ſeeing the board? Philidor replied, that as he had calculated moves, and even whole games, at night in bed, he thought he could do it, and immediately played a game with the Abbé Chenard, which he won without ſeeing the board, and without heſitating upon any of the moves.—Philidor then finding he could readily play a ſingle game, offered to play two games at the ſame time, which he did at a Coffee-houſe."* Such an exhi-

* Twiſs (*Cheſs*, vol. i. p. 151.)—Twiſs merely gives the queſtion by Légal: I have endeavoured to account for that queſtion by connecting it with the ſtatement made by Légal to Diderot. La Bourdonnais (or whoever was the author of the trifling *Biographie* in the firſt volume of his *Palamède*) ſtates the matter thus: "There was a converſation going on, one day, (he ſays,) in the preſence of M. de Légal and Philidor in reference to the great Italian players. Some were mentioned, who had played ſeveral games at a time, blindfold. M. de Légal appeared not only to doubt the reality of the alleged facts, but alſo to think the thing impoſſible. Philidor replied, that he could not agree with him; that he had often recalled difficult poſitions, in the night, etc." (*Palamède*, t. i. p. 149.) There is both fiction and miſchief in this. To diſguiſe La Bourdonnais's failure in the attempt to equal Philidor in blindfold playing, Philidor's achievements were miſrepreſented and depreciated in La Bourdonnais and Méry's *Palamède*. In this paſſage of the *Biographie*, the object was to make it appear, that Philidor knew, at the outſet, that the great Italians, Paolo Boi and the Jeſuit Saccheri, had been wont to play four blindfold games at once; that he was, therefore, neither unique nor original (as he was ſuppoſed to be) in the poſſeſſion of this faculty; and that in playing *three* games at once, with the knowledge of a higher ſtandard, he had undoubtedly reached the utmoſt limit of his powers. Méry even hints, in another place, (*Palamède*, t. ii. pp. 6–7,) that Philidor's *real* limit

bition of fancy and memory was too novel and too portentous not to have been often repeated; it was a phenomenon for the pſychologiſt no leſs than for the Cheſs-player; and the celebrity of the hero was extended far beyond the limits of the royal Chapel and of the *Café de la Régence*. At that period, Diderot and D'Alembert were meditating their too famous *Encyclopédie*, and when, a few years later, they began to iſſue volume after volume, they did not forget, although Philidor himſelf was living abroad at the time, to record the pſychological phe-

---

was the ſame as La Bourdonnais's, viz., *two* games at once—a piece of miſrepreſentation for which he was juſtly cenſured by M. St. Amant in his *Palamède*, (t. vii. pp. 179, 180.) Now, the alleged diſbelief of Légal in the poſſibility of blindfold playing is inconſiſtent with his own ſtatement to Diderot, that he had played one ſuch game himſelf. The converſation, therefore, could never have taken place; it is "an invention of the enemy." For my own part, I do not believe that Philidor ever attained the full development of his powers in either mode of playing. If he had really been aware, that Paolo Boi had played four ſimultaneous games, I think that Philidor, when in the fulneſs of youthful ſtrength and health, could and would have done the ſame—juſt as we have ſeen Mr. Harrwitz play eight games after Paul Morphy. That Philidor and everybody elſe, at that day, were as ignorant of Cheſs-Literature as I have ſaid, is alſo affirmed by the unfriendly authority of Vogt, (*Letters*, pp. 86–87.) The alluſions of Philidor to Carrera, in the Preface to the firſt edition of his *Analyſe*, are ſo expreſſed, as to prove, that he had not read what he ſtrangely calls "this big book on *the origin and progreſs* of the game;" but had merely got from it—what did not abſolutely require a knowledge of Italian—a proper name or two, with a *Game* or a *Poſition*.

nomenon, of which they had undoubtedly been witneſſes.*

It is obvious enough, that a light-hearted youth of from fourteen to eighteen could hardly be expected to ſit all day ſtudying Cheſs with Légal, at the *Café de la Régence*—to be enjoying the ſenſation created by his blindfold games—and at the ſame time to keep regular hours with his muſic pupils. He neglected them, (as he admitted to Twiſs), and they conſequently took another maſter. It muſt not be inferred, however, that the neglect of his pupils amounted to an abandonment of his profeſſion. He would never, probably, have been a punctual *Teacher*, at any rate—Cheſs or no Cheſs—and that becauſe he had, with the genius, the temperament of a *Compoſer*:—he was always abſolutely abſorbed by his muſical meditations, no leſs than, at another hour,

* I copy the language of the *Encyclopédie* from Twiſs: "We had at Paris, a young man of eighteen, who played at the ſame time two games at Cheſs, without ſeeing the boards, beating two antagoniſts, to either of whom he, though a firſt-rate player, could only give the advantage of a Knight, when ſeeing the board. We ſhall add to this account, a circumſtance of which we were eye-witneſſes: In the middle of one of his games, a falſe move was deſignedly made, which after a great number of moves he diſcovered, and placed the piece where it ought to have been at firſt. This young man is named Mr. Philidor, the ſon of a muſician of repute; he himſelf is a great muſician, and, perhaps, the beſt player of Poliſh Draughts there ever was, or ever will be. This is among the moſt extraordinary examples of ſtrength of memory, and imagination."

by his game; and he was as little capable of taking note of time in one caſe as in the other. But if we accept his too honeſt confeſſion, that Cheſs ſpoiled him for a Teacher, in his youth, let us be fair enough to accept, with equal readineſs of aſſent, his later declaration, that Muſic had at no time ceaſed to be his ſtudy.* Such a declaration, after the event, may always, indeed, be, in the nature of things, a little ſuſpicious; but that of Philidor happens to be ſupported—for this period, at leaſt—by abundant proof. During his moſt aſſiduous practice of Cheſs, with M. de Légal, Philidor regularly carried his annual tribute of a Motett to the royal Chapel, at Verſailles; when the Chevalier de Jaucourt recorded his feats of blindfold playing, he ſaid—not that he *had been*—but that he *was*, at the time, a "great muſician;" and the firſt of that ſeries of journeys, by which his reputation as a Cheſs-player was ſpread over Europe, was undertaken ſolely in purſuance of a muſical engagement. Nay, it is as a muſician, doing profeſſional work by contract, that Philidor figures in a tranſaction of this very period—a tranſaction, which exhibits him in cloſe relations with the Philoſopher of Geneva.

* In the advertiſement, which Philidor inſerted in the *Public Advertiſer*, December 9th, 1753, he affirmed "that the Art of Muſic had been at all times his conſtant ſtudy and application, and Cheſs only his diverſion."—Twiſs, (*Cheſs*, vol. ii. p. 216.)

Jean-Jacques Rouſſeau had come to Paris, in 1741, at the age of twenty-nine, with the expectation of gaining a name and fortune by means of a new ſcheme of muſical notation. Failing in this, and reaſoning, that he might ſecure the ſame ends by proving himſelf to be *firſt* in ſomething elſe, juſt as well, he began daily to frequent the *Café de la Régence*, and to contend with its ſtrongeſt players for the primacy of Cheſs.* He was beaten by them all; but he played reſolutely on, with the aſſured conviction, that he ſhould, one day, have his turn of beating them. He choſe his adverſaries wiſely—for among them he names both Philidor and Légal. Before he had ſucceeded in beating either of them, he was called away to Venice, to take the place of private ſecretary to the French ambaſſador. On his return to Paris, in 1745, he returned alſo to his old opinion, that he was to achieve greatneſs by means of Muſic. To that end, he reſumed a work, which he had laid aſide, when entering on his Cheſs-campaign—an Opera, namely, in three acts, entitled *Les Muſes galantes*. This he wiſhed to bring out, at firſt, privately, at the houſe of M. de la Popelinière, who, as *fermier-général*, was a genuine ſucceſſor of the munificent *ſurintendant*, Nicolas Fouquet. Like Fouquet, La Popelinière was fond of

* The hiſtory of Rouſſeau's learning Cheſs, a few years before, is given by him in an amuſing paragraph of his *Confeſſions*, (liv. v.)

ſeeing himſelf ſurrounded by men of mind and mark, with little regard to birth, or ſtanding, or even to character; and his manſion, at Paſſy, was made to contain every appliance for enabling the artiſts, who ſought his patronage, to exhibit their talents under the moſt favourable auſpices. He had his Theatre, with Marmontel for his dramatic poet. He had his Chapel, too; and his Organiſt and *Maître de Chapelle* was no other than Rameau.*

It may be taken as a matter of courſe, that young Philidor, in his double character of precocious Muſician and portentous Cheſs-player, had been preſſed into what was called La Popelinière's *ménagerie*, nor could any formal *procès-verbal*, duly authenticated, add ſtrength to my aſſurance, that Philidor's Motetts took their turn in La Popelinière's Chapel, under the direction of his friend Rameau, and that Philidor's exhibition of blindfold playing had been repeated in La Popelinière's drawing-room, before a company, which embraced the Duc de Richelieu and Diderot, the painter La Tour, and the unrivalled mechaniſt, Vaucanſon, ſide by ſide with every ſort of foreign virtuoſo and adventurer. Philidor was, at any rate, the common friend of many of the celebrities, that formed this aſſemblage; and when the compoſer of *Les Muſes galantes* required the help of a thorough-

* What I ſay of M. de la Popelinière is derived from a very intereſting article in the *Biographie Univerſelle.*

bred muſician to lick his really genial production into a preſentable ſhape, it was to young Philidor that he applied.

To what extent, and with what ſucceſs, Philidor aſſiſted Rouſſeau, is ſtated differently by different parties. There ſeems to have been a tradition in Philidor's family, that he executed his taſk with characteriſtic abnegation of ſelf—that he ſo managed his ſymphonies and accompaniments, as to keep them entirely ſubordinate, while they gave relief to the melodies of the amateur compoſer.* But, from Rouſſeau's own account, on the other hand, it would at leaſt appear, that any efforts Philidor may have made to preſerve the appearance of unity in the workmanſhip had been entirely unſucceſsful. Rameau praiſed the Overture, indeed,—but not as being the production of Rouſſeau; and to the execution of the Opera itſelf he liſtened with various indications, now of impatience and now of ſuſpicion, until at laſt he exclaimed—ill-naturedly enough—that part of what he had heard was the work of a conſummate muſician, and the reſt that of the mereſt ignoramus in the art. Honeſt Jean-Jacques, therefore, is not at

* Such is Lardin's ſtatement in the *Palamède*, t. vii. p. 11, only that he ſpeaks of Philidor's aſſiſtance as given to Rouſſeau for *Le Devin du Village*. But this was impoſſible: *Le Devin du Village* was compoſed and repreſented two years before Philidor's return from his nine years' reſidence abroad.

all diſpoſed to overſtate what had been contributed to the aforeſaid "ignoramus" by the "conſummate muſician." He makes Philidor to have done but little; nor does he give the leaſt hint, that that little was what drew forth the praiſe of Rameau.* Without attempting to decide between the compoſer and his critic, it is enough for my preſent purpoſe to have ſhown, by an incident of ſome intereſt in itſelf, that down to the laſt of Philidor's early days in Paris, before his long reſidence abroad, he had never ceaſed to be a Muſician, in the practice of his art.

* *Confeſſions*, liv. vii.

CHAPTER II.

PHILIDOR'S RESIDENCE ABROAD.

TOWARDS the cloſe of the ſame year, 1745, in which Philidor had been lending his profeſſional aſſiſtance to Jean-Jacques Rouſſeau, he was induced to leave home, for a ſhort muſical tour, which was unexpectedly converted into a long reſidence abroad.* At his age, and in his ſituation, the tour—even if its accidental reſult had been foreſeen—could have preſented itſelf to his mind

* If, as Twiſs informs us, Philidor went to Holland in 1745, and—about a twelvemonth later—to England in 1747, he muſt have left home quite near the cloſe of the year 1745. This inference is ſtrengthened by the conſideration, that his aſſiſtance to Rouſſeau appears to have been given immediately before the rehearſal at La Popelinière's, in the preſence of the Duc de Richelieu. But Richelieu was an aide-de-camp of Louis XV. during the campaign of that ſummer, and could hardly have returned to Paris before the King, viz., on the 7th of September. The rehearſal was probably ſtill later than that date; for Rouſſeau did not begin to work on his Opera until long after his return from Venice in the ſpring—the ſummer having been devoted to Thérèſe Levaſſeur—and he was not a rapid worker.

only as a moſt attractive adventure. He was now barely nineteen, and—although mature in profeſſional knowledge, and by no means frivolous or irregular in character and habits—was full of youthful ſpirits and enterpriſe. Hardly a year, moreover, had elapſed, ſince he had begun to attract attention, in Pariſian circles, as a phenomenon; and the proſpect of appearing in the ſame character, among the curious, the learned, and the noble, in foreign countries, would naturally be a moſt agreeable one. He had no pupils, and no official connexion with either Theatre or Chapel, to bind him to Paris. Nay, as a muſician of genius, born to be a reformer of his country's muſic, he muſt have already begun to feel ſome vague longing, at leaſt, to ſeek elſewhere for ſomething that ſhould better meet the ideal, now gradually ſhaping itſelf in his mind, than what he was daily familiar with, and to ſatiety, at home. Under theſe circumſtances, even a leſs inviting opening than that which actually preſented itſelf, might have been a ſufficient inducement to young Philidor to "try his fortune," for a time, among ſtrangers.*

* I ſaid before, (p. 13,) that Philidor went abroad ſolely in purſuance of a muſical engagement. Such appears to have been the only reaſon given by him to Twiſs. But La Borde muſt have heard from Philidor the other ſide of the caſe: he ſays, that Philidor's progreſs in Cheſs excited in him the deſire of travelling, to "try his luck" (*pour*

A new phenomenon appeared, about that time, at Paris, in the perſon of a young harpſichord-player of thirteen, the daughter of an Italian by the name of LANZA. Such a *virtuoſa* was ſo regular a ſubject for "Sultan" La Popelinière's *ménagerie*, that the imagination waits for no other evidence, to picture her as exhibiting her ſkill in the manſion at

---

tenter fortune). Gerber, author of the *Hiſtoriſch-Biographiſches Lexicon der Tonkünſtler*, (Leipſic, 1792,) although he knew nothing of Twiſs, and baſed his article on La Borde, had the good ſenſe, nevertheleſs, to interpret La Borde by his own knowledge of Philidor's occupations in Germany. He therefore ſays: "The progreſs, which he had, by this means, made in his art, and eſpecially the ſkill, which he had at the ſame time acquired in Cheſs, excited in him the deſire to try his fortune in foreign lands." (2. Theil, 127.) Undoubtedly, a muſical engagement furniſhed Philidor the *occaſion* for going abroad: he had other *motives*, however, beſides the deſire of profeſſional improvement, for being glad that ſuch an occaſion ſhould have preſented itſelf; but I do by no means recogniſe, as even *one* of thoſe motives—what M. Fétis makes the *only* one—the wiſh or the neceſſity of *abſconding* to get rid of debts. To believe, that a boy of nineteen could have been in ſuch a ſituation, we muſt have ſome reaſonable ſhow of evidence. But M. Fétis's ſole authority was "a celebrated Cheſs-player," one M. Dunant, who did not know enough of Philidor to know where he was, from 1745 to 1754. And yet this idle ſtory is repeated—with the gratuitous improvement, that creditors were the ſtanding torment of his life (*la grande plaie de ſa vie*)—by a very clever author of the day, who—while meaning well by Philidor—has been ſo far from going behind his careleſs authorities, as to follow them in relating, that Philidor, like Handel, became blind—ſuch being the French verſion of "playing without ſight of board and men." (P. Scudo, *Critique et Littérature Muſicales*, deuxième ſérie, pp. 472–3.)

Paſſy, with the bright-eyed François-André, among the reſt, for an admiring liſtener. At all events, Philidor became acquainted with the father. Signor Lanza, it appears—whether juſt arrived from England, or not—had made an arrangement with the celebrated violiniſt, Geminiani, who was then reſiding at London, to meet him in Holland, for the purpoſe of giving twelve ſubſcription-concerts, in which the young harpſichord-wonder was to perform. He now engaged Philidor to be of the party and of the adventure. As Philidor never played on any inſtrument—the kettle-drum of his anceſtor being as much beyond his ſkill as the baſſoon of his father—his part in the concerts muſt have been one, in which either his ſcience was called into requiſition, or ſuch vocal powers as his pageſhip had left him. At the moment of ſetting out on the journey, the daughter was indiſpoſed. She was, therefore, left behind, with her mother, at Paris, until ſhe ſhould be able to travel; while the father proceeded to Holland, in company with Philidor, to keep his appointment with Geminiani. At Rotterdam, where the party (it would ſeem) was to rendezvous, there arrived—not the daughter of Signor Lanza—but the news of her death. The whole concert-ſcheme, with all its proſpects of emolument, was thus ſuddenly deſtroyed by the hand of fate; and our ſanguine adventurer, whoſe reſources had been entirely pro-

ſpective, now found himſelf pennileſs and a ſtranger in a foreign city.

The deſtitution and involuntary exile, which had ſo ſuddenly and violently come on "as an armed man," muſt certainly, at firſt, have given a ſevere ſhock to the ſpirits of the young muſician, whoſe boyhood and youth, up to that day, had baſked in the ſunſhine of affection and of the admiration due to his double inheritance of genius. But Philidor was too amiably attractive to be left long without friends anywhere, and too cheerful by organization ever to deſpair. He had, undoubtedly, already learned, while awaiting the arrival of the poor *Signorina*, that if Rotterdam could boaſt of no claſſic *Café de la Régence*, with its order of Cheſs-magnates, it could point to plenty of homely coffee-houſes, where pairs of heavy Dutchmen ſat pondering over a larger board, deliberately puzzling their brains with the intricacies of Poliſh Draughts. Philidor's remarkable ſkill in this difficult and ſcientific game may have been rated too high in the *Encyclopédie*, it contributed little to his celebrity, and he himſelf took no great pride in it; but it now did him yeoman's ſervice.* He became at once a Maſ-

* "Philidor's ſkill in Poliſh Draughts is rather overrated by the writers of this article, [in the *Encyclopédie*,] as we know that, although a firſt-rate, he was not equal to M. Le Blonde, and ſeveral other great players of that day. In a voluminous collection of critical ends of games at Poliſh Draughts, (publiſhed by Dufour, Paris, 1808,) I find

ter among the Dutch Draught-players; and upon what he earned in this capacity, whether in the ſhape of fees or of ſtakes, he lived for a time—and, apparently, in no diſtreſs—firſt, at Rotterdam, and afterwards at Amſterdam.*

But the political capital of the country, now that a winter of cabinet-councils and diplomatic conferences had ſucceeded to an eventful campaign, preſented greater attractions to Philidor, than the coffee-houſes of the great commercial cities. He proceeded, therefore, to the Hague; and there he remained during the greater part of his reſidence in Holland. It was not, however, the cunning men of peace alone, that he found there. The armies had gone into winter-quarters; and many of the officers were now, of courſe, at liberty to exchange

---

ſix ingenious poſitions of Philidor's compoſition." (Walker's *Biographical Sketch*, p. xiv. note.) A correſpondent of the La Bourdonnais *Palamède* (tome iv. p. 120) ſpeaks, on the other hand, of Philidor as "le premier joueur de Dames connu." St. Amant (*Palamède*, tome vii. p. 15, note) probably means to go no farther than Walker: "Il était également aux Dames d'une force tout-à-fait ſupérieure, mais n'y attachait pas le même amour-propre qu'aux Échecs."

* The following memorandum of Twiſs (vol. i. p. 3) points to a later reſidence of Philidor's at Rotterdam: "Mr. Philidor informed me that he ſaw, in 1747, at Rotterdam, in the poſſeſſion of a coffee-houſe keeper, a ſet of Cheſs-men, which were made for Prince Eugene. They were three inches in height, of ſolid ſilver, chaſed; not different in colour, but ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed, by one ſide repreſenting an European, and the other an Aſiatic, army."

the monotony of mere camp-duty for the gay life of a city thronged with foreign viſitors. Among them ſome were found as ready to ſhow their proweſs in mimic as in real war; and at the gentle Frenchman's Cheſs-board there doubtleſs came to ſit, in peaceful meditation, many a ſurvivor of that array of warriors, who, on the 11th of May, before, had ſtruggled, with indomitable hardihood, in ſublime advance and ſtill ſublimer retreat, to "keep front and rear together," in the memorable column of Fontenoy.* The chivalrous Sir John Ligonier, who had acted as the royal Duke's military tutor on that bloody day, had been recalled to England, to head Gardiner's dragoons—ſo long as they would face the Highland hoſt—at Falkirk; but he had left behind him his relative, Colonel la Deves; and to him Philidor gave the Knight in many a Cheſs-encounter. The Prince of Waldeck, who had ſeen his Dutch diviſion behave ſo ill at Fontenoy, had met with ſtill another diſaſter at Rocoux. He, too, was at the Hague, ready to receive a Piece from the youthful

* Should military hiſtories fail to preſerve the memory of this battle, it will ſtill be remembered, for it has been lightened upon by the genius of Scott. Who can read without a thrill Edie Ochiltree's queſtion: "Francie Magraw, do ye no remember Fontenoy, and 'Keep front and rear thegither?'" I wiſh Mr. Davis's Ballad (Hayes's *Ballads of Ireland*, vol. i. p. 213) may be as ſucceſsful in ſecuring their juſt ſhare of credit to the fiery ſoldiers of the Irish Brigade, for their part in breaking and forcing back the Engliſh column.

maſter. The princely pupil not only rewarded him nobly for his inſtructions, but alſo bore away a kind remembrance of him for aftertime.

In 1747, and quite probably in conſequence of the agreeable relations formed with the Britiſh officers at the Hague, Philidor made the firſt of thoſe viſits to England, which he was deſtined ſo often afterwards to repeat. The Engliſh liked Philidor; and as they are not haſty likers, their taking to him ſo kindly and always continuing to award him their reſpect and their patronage, is a certain proof of the rare amiability and ſubſtantial good character of the man. Here "Sir Abraham Janſſen, (ſays Twiſs,) introduced him to all the celebrated players of the time.* Sir Abraham was not only the beſt Cheſs-player in England, but likewiſe the beſt player he ever met with, after his Maſter, M. de Légal, as the Baronet was able to win one game in four with

* "The beſt players who were living in England, during this century, were Mr. Cunningham, Lord Sunderland, Lord Godolphin, Mr. Cargyll, Sir Abraham Janſſen, P. Stamma, Dr. Black, Dr. Cowper, and Mr. Salvador. Moſt of theſe gentlemen were to be met at Old Slaughter's Coffee-houſe, St. Martin's Lane, in a private room." (*Cheſs*, vol. i. pp. 162–3.) Only the five laſt are mentioned in any connexion with Philidor. Cunningham, the Scholar and Juriſt, was already dead in 1730; and Cunningham, the Hiſtorian, although alive in 1735, was then extremely old. The puzzling queſtion, which of theſe *Doppelgänger* (as De Quincey calls them) is the Cheſs-player's Cunningham, appears to have been ſet at reſt, for the firſt time, by Dr. Irving, in his *Lives of Scottiſh Writers*, (vol. ii. pp. 220–38.)

him *even:* and M. de Légal, with whom Sir Abraham afterwards played in Paris, was of the ſame opinion with regard to his ſkill."*

One of the celebrated players, then in England, was Philip Stamma of Aleppo, who was employed by the Government as a tranſlator of deſpatches in the Oriental languages.† Although he had publiſhed the firſt edition of his famous ſituations at Paris, it is not likely that he and Philidor had ever met there; for in 1737, when Stamma printed his book, Philidor was in the royal Chapel, with ſeveral years of his apprenticeſhip ſtill before him. A match was now arranged between them, to conſiſt of ten games, Philidor giving the move, allowing a drawn game to be a loſt one, and betting five to four on each game. The French champion loſt only two games, one of which was drawn.‡ There

* Count Brühl, however, makes Philidor able to give Sir Abraham ſlight odds: "By all accounts, the beſt player this country (England) has produced, was the late Sir Abraham Janſſen, who uſed to play on even terms with Philidor, and to whom he could not give more than the Pawn for the move—an advantage which amounts to little more than the firſt move." Letter to Daines Barrington, (*Archæologia*, vol. ix. p. 14.)

† Daines Barrington, (*Archæologia*, vol. ix. and in *Cheſs Player's Chronicle*, vol. i. p. 110.)

‡ I have a warm fellow-feeling with an editor's or a biographer's partiality for his hero; but I muſt enter my reſpectful proteſt againſt Herr von Oppen's view of Philidor's conteſt with Stamma as a conteſt between *Science* and *Genius*—an encounter, in which Genius—

is no poſitive ſtatement that they played any other than theſe match-games together; but it is in the higheſt degree probable that they did; for it would be hard to believe, that Stamma was not a frequenter, with Philidor, of the Club of gentlemen at Slaughter's Coffee-houſe; it is expreſſly ſtated by Twiſs, that Stamma was one of thoſe to whom Philidor became able to give the Knight in a certain monſtrous kind of Cheſs, which a Duke of Rutland had been perverſe enough to invent, and Sir Abraham Janſſen fooliſh enough to delight in playing;*

although ſhe naturally gets the worſt of it—ſecures more of admiration, for the irregular brilliancy of the fight ſhe makes, than her dull adverſary, for winning by mere ſtolid adherence to rule and precept. Stamma's ſtyle—if (as we know) his favourite game was the dry *Queen's Gambit*—was anything but what Herr von Oppen conceives it to have been. Nay, there is every reaſon to believe, that Stamma had (partially, at leaſt) formed his ſtyle of play in the ſame ſchool as his adverſary—unleſs we can ſuppoſe the Syrian to have lived long enough in Paris to have publiſhed a Cheſs-book there, without frequenting the *Café de la Régence* and trying his ſtrength with Philidor's maſter, M. de Légal.—(L. Bledow und O. v. Oppen, *Stamma's Hundert Endſpiele*, p. 2.)

* "At this game, the board is fourteen ſquares in breadth, and ten in height, which makes one hundred and forty houſes; fourteen pieces and fourteen pawns on a ſide; the pawns might move either one, two, or three ſquares, the firſt time. The pieces were, the *King*, the *Queen*, then two *Biſhops*, two *Knights*, a *Crowned Caſtle*, uniting the move of the King and Caſtle, and a common *Caſtle*. On the other ſide of the King, was a *Concubine*, whoſe move was that of the Caſtle and the Knight united, two *Biſhops*, a ſingle *Knight*, a *Crowned Caſtle* and a *common* one. The beſt players at this game, after Sir Abraham, were

and Philidor is reported to have ſaid, that his Cheſs-talent had been developed by playing with Stamma —a ſtatement which could hardly have been applied to playing a ſingle match of ten games.*

In 1748, Philidor returned to Holland, where he compoſed his Treatiſe on Cheſs. So Twiſs tells us, briefly enough. There was much to draw him in that direction. A brilliant campaign had opened, in which the Duke of Cumberland, fluſhed with his triumph over the Young Chevalier, was ſtruggling in vain to hold his own againſt his brother Cheſs-player,† the victor of Fontenoy. But, whe-

Stamma, Dr. Cowper, and Mr. Salvador. Philidor, in leſs than two months, was able to give a Knight to each of theſe gentlemen at this game."—Twiſs, (*Cheſs*, vol. i. pp. 155–6.)

* Fétis's words are: "lui-même a ſouvent dit à d'anciens joueurs du *Café de la Régence* que j'ai connus, que ſon talent aux échecs s'était développé en Hollande, en jouant avec Stamma et d'autres joueurs de première force." The old Cheſs-players were probably right in all but the *place*: they ſpoke under the impreſſion, which they communicated to Fétis alſo, that Philidor was in no other country but Holland, during the whole of his reſidence abroad. Before the year 1745, however, when Philidor left home, Stamma had become a fixed reſident of London, where he publiſhed, that very year, the laſt and complete edition of his book, under the title of *The Noble Game of Cheſs*. Nay, I do not believe that Stamma *ever* lived in Holland at all: at any rate, the reprint of the *Eſſai* at the Hague, in 1741, is rather evidence that he did not, than that he did; for that reprint indicates, by its *bookſeller's* advertiſement, that the *author* had nothing to do with it; and Stamma indirectly, but pointedly, ignores it, in the Preface to the edition of London, 1745.

† A proof of Marſhal Saxe's intereſt in Cheſs is given by the

ther loſing or gaining ground, the Duke was ſtill attended by the friendly officers, who had crowded around the young Frenchman's board two years before at the Hague. Aix-la-Chapelle, too, preſented its attractions. The ſtartling check, which the Comte de Saxe had given at Maeſtricht, had made the Britiſh more than willing to bring the war to a cloſe elſewhere than on the field of battle; and envoys plenipotentiary, with their uſual attachés and following, were diſturbing the repoſe of Charlemagne with their eager diſcuſſions. Here was an opportunity, not to be loſt, of claiming for Cheſs its proper rank among the great intereſts of civilized man. Whether Lord Sandwich, the Engliſh plenipotentiary, had known Philidor in London, or not, is not mentioned; but at Aix-la-Chapelle he proved himſelf a kind and uſeful friend. He put down his

"*deux Mats*" publiſhed in La Bourdonnais's *Palamède*, (tome ii. pp. 41–43,) and elſewhere. The proof, however, is not quite ſo decisive as could be wiſhed; for it may be doubted whether Marſhal Saxe was the compoſer of either of the "*deux Mats*" in queſtion. Both of them belong to the claſs, known among the Germans as *Spieſſrutbenſpiele*, i. e. *Running-the-gauntlet Problems*, all of which are imitations of the ingenious original of an Italian eccleſiaſtic, (Don Pietro Petronio,) given by Salvio, (ed. 1732, p. 64.) One of them was certainly compoſed by Profeſſor Wildt of Caſſel, (See Koch's *Codex*, vol. ii. p. 296,) more than half a century after the Marſhal's death; and of the other, Montigny, (who appears to have been the firſt to publiſh it,) merely ſays, (*Stratagèmes*, Première Partie, p. 77,) Ce coup *eſt attribué* au Maréchal de Saxe.

name for ten copies of the *Analyſe*; and the liſt glitters with the inſignia of other diplomatic agents, who followed the grand Engliſhman's example at a reſpectful diſtance. He alſo judiciouſly adviſed Philidor to proceed to the Duke of Cumberland's headquarters at Eyndhoven, between unlucky Maeſtricht and Bois-le-Duc. The Duke played with him, and—for Cheſs-players at leaſt—wiped out from his eſcutcheon all the ſtains of his Culloden campaign, by ſubſcribing himſelf for fifty copies of Philidor's book, and by procuring a great number of other ſubſcribers—the gallant Britiſh officers, (it may be preſumed,) whoſe names conſtitute ſo large a proportion of the hundred and twenty-ſeven, that figure on the Liſt.

Philidor returned to England to carry his work through the preſs. It was publiſhed at London, in 1749, under the title of L'ANALYSE *du Jeu des Echecs*.* Being entirely incompetent myſelf to diſ-

* La Borde had mentioned, that Philidor publiſhed his *Analyſe* at London, in 1749. M. Fétis, therefore, flatly denies the very exiſtence of ſuch an edition, with a reſoluteneſs of ſkepticiſm, that is truly delightful: "Outre qu'il y a bien peu de vraiſemblance qui'l y ait eu dans la tête d'un jeune homme de vingt-deux ans aſſez d'expérience de toutes les fineſſes, de toutes les variétés de ce jeu, pour arriver à la clarté, à la ſimplicité des principes expoſés dans ce livre, mes recherches dans les bibliographies générales, et dans les catalogues, n'ont pu me faire découvrir cette édition de 1749." A book publiſhed in ſo large an edition, as even the four hundred and thirty-three copies ſub-

cuſs the value of the *Analyſe* as a work of Cheſs-ſcience, I am ſingularly fortunate in being able to refer the reader to the Eſſay on PHILIDOR *as Cheſs-author and Cheſs-player*, which the great German Maſter, Herr VON HEYDEBRAND UND DER LASA, has done me the honour to append to my little Biography. It ſuffices for me to ſay here, that the immediate ſucceſs of the book muſt have more than fulfilled the moſt ſanguine anticipations of its author. It was ſpeedily tranſlated into Engliſh and German, and more than once reprinted in the original French, before Philidor had returned to his native country. More fortunate than moſt didactic compoſitions, it has ſtill retained a poſition of peculiar honour, although now, ſo far from ſtanding, as at firſt, alone, it has fellows that are worthy to be its peers. Even the *Theory* of the *Analyſe*—that THE PAWNS ARE THE SOUL OF CHESS—one-ſided as it may appear—is ſtill reſolutely maintained by one, whoſe name is everywhere held in eſteem,—the great Ruſſian author, Major JÆNISCH, who makes the very title of his own palmary work (*Nouvelle Analyſe*)

ſcribed for would make, could by no poſſibility become, within a hundred years, ſuch a book as a De Bure would honour with his majuſcular RARE, unleſs the hands of Cheſs-players were as deſtructive as thoſe of the *bonnêtes artiſans* of Brunet, which have ſo nearly annihilated the Elzevir *Paſtiſſier Français*. The *Analyſe* of London, 1749, is readily ſecured by every collector: I have myſelf had three copies.

pay homage to the work of Philidor. The homage of many others may, indeed, be unintelligent and unreaſonable, juſt as the carping of ſome envious rival authors may have been uncandid and unjuſt; but I think it may be ſafely ſaid, that the *Analyſe* of Philidor is one of thoſe "barks launched on the Ocean of Time," that are doomed never to be engulfed in its waves. It is a work of GENIUS. Originality looks out from every page; an energetic vitality ſpeaks out from every line. Hence the charm, which it ſtill has, even for thoſe who do not wholly accept its theory.

Of this ſecond reſidence of Philidor's in England it is further recorded by Twiſs, that he frequented the houſe of the French Ambaſſador, the Duc de Mirepoix, who was an expert Cheſs-player, and gave a weekly Cheſs-dinner; and that in 1751, while he was at Windſor, with the Duke of Cumberland, he introduced Dr. Black, a clergyman, who kept a ſchool at Chiſwick, as a firſt-rate Cheſs-player, to the Duc de Mirepoix, at his country-houſe at Hammerſmith. The Doctor turned this talent to ſuch advantage, that the Duke ſolicited, and obtained for him, the year following, a living of two hundred pounds per annum, which was in the gift of the then King, George II.

"Philidor remained another year in England, and learning that the King of Pruſſia was fond of Cheſs,

he ſet off for Berlin in 1751. The King ſaw him play ſeveral times at Potſdam, but did not play with him himſelf. There was a Marquis de Varennes and a certain Jew, who played *even* with the King, and to each of theſe Philidor gave a Knight, and beat them." Such is Twiſs's dry and meagre account of Philidor's viſit to the capital of the Great Frederic. The little that can be added from other ſources is not without intereſt. The celebrated mathematician, Euler—whom we may reckon among celebrated Cheſs-authors, alſo, for his algebraic Memoir on the Knight's Tour—was, at that time, living in Berlin. Fortunately, the mereſt fragments that fall from ſuch great arithmeticians are ſacred; and thus a contemporary letter of Euler's (bearing date July 3d, 1751) has been preſerved,* from which we learn, that he too ſhared in the intereſt, which was excited by the preſence of Philidor. Euler, it ſeems, was a Cheſs-*player*, as well as Cheſs-*author*, and would gladly have encountered the famous ſtranger over the board, but he could find no opportunity. His explanation of the cauſe ſhows us, that

* In the *Correſpondance Mathématique et Phyſique de célèbres Géomètres du xviiième Siècle*, Part Firſt, p. 545. The letter was ferreted out by the Cheſs-playing aſtronomer, Schumacher of Altona, and communicated by him to the Berlin *Schachzeitung* for 1848, (p. 545.) The date of Euler's letter ſhows that Twiſs ſhould have made 1750, and not 1751, the year of Philidor's leaving England for Berlin.

Philidor's relations were immediately with the Court: he could not be found at Berlin, becauſe he ſpent the moſt of his time at Potſdam, the favourite reſidence of the King.* The goſſiping geometer does not forget to relate, that Philidor, *although* ſaid to be ſtill a very young man, had ſelected a travelling companion of ſuch a character, that he was compelled to haſten his departure, to eſcape the vexatious rivalry of certain military men.†

The accurate Gerber, on the other hand, had gathered—after the lapſe of thirty years—ſuch memorials of Philidor's reſidence at Berlin, as proved

* Thirty-two years later, Philidor preſented a copy of his *Carmen Seculare* to the Prince Royal of Pruſſia, afterwards King Frederic William II. The Prince's very courteous and amiable note of thanks confirms Twiſs's and Euler's ſtatement of Philidor's relations with perſons about the Court: "Je me rappelle toujours avec plaiſir, Monſieur, quoique j'étais fort jeune alors, [ſeven years old,] de vous avoir vu à Berlin jouer aux Echecs avec mon inſtituteur" [probably M. Beguelin.]

† Leſt the text ſhould not be thought clear enough, I here preſent the curious reader with Euler's own German: "Er ſoll noch ein ſehr junger Mann ſein, führte aber eine Maitreſſe mit ſich, wegen welcher er mit einigen Officieren in Potſdam Verdrieſſlichkeiten bekommen, welche ihn genöthiget unvermuthet wegzureiſen." I do not believe, that Philidor "brought with him" to the Court of Frederic the Great, or took with him to the Palace of the Prince of Waldeck, any perſon of the above French-German deſignation. What remains of the ſcandal, after performing this ſubtraction, is likely enough (I am ſorry to ſay) to have been true. A lively young French muſician could not be expected to be far in advance of his age in ſuch matters.

that his Chefs-doings there had been far more brilliant than had come to the knowledge of Euler. No other authority preſerves the fact, that Philidor exhibited his feats of blindfold playing during his reſidence abroad. Nay, it appears generally to have been believed, that the attempt at playing more than two ſuch games at once was firſt made by him at London, ſo late as 1783. But from Gerber we learn, that in 1751 Philidor played three ſimultaneous blindfold games, at Berlin, againſt three ſkilful players, and won them all.* The ſame careful biographer adds the important information, that Philidor by no means ſpent his time at Berlin as a mere idle Chefs-player. In England (he ſays) Philidor had gained large ſums of money by the ſubſcription for his Chefs-book; but in Germany he became a gainer in another way,—in knowledge of Muſic and of Muſical Compoſition. He not only

* From this well-authenticated inſtance, I have felt authorized to infer, (*ante*, p. 19,) that it entered into Philidor's plans, on leaving home, to win admiration—if not to gain emolument—by the exhibition of his gift of blindfold playing. I have no doubt, that he did actually make ſuch exhibitions, not at Berlin alone, but alſo at the Hague, Aix-la-Chapelle, Eyndhoven, and wherever he found any royal and princely perſonages, or any illuſtrious aſſemblage, to invite him. The preſents, which he would receive on ſuch occaſions, would do more to keep him above want, than his earnings from the Chefs or Draught board. The only wonder is, that he ſhould have ſaid nothing of the matter to Twiſs.

endeavoured to improve his taſte by liſtening to the execution of *cheſs-d'œuvres* in Muſic, but alſo (according to ſome of Gerber's authorities) had actually ſtudied under a great Maſter of the art, then reſiding at Berlin.

Philidor left the Pruſſian capital before the middle of the following year, and reaped the fruit of his agreeable relations with the Prince of Waldeck, in 1746, by now enjoying his hoſpitality for eight months at Arolſen. After ſpending three weeks at the Court of the Landgrave of Heſſe-Caſſel, he finally returned to England, where he remained until near the cloſe of the year 1754.

Of this third reſidence in England the only record that remains relates to Philidor's muſical doings. It appears, that not long after his arrival in England he appeared before the public with ſome "Latin [Church] Muſic," and that he had experienced how much his more brilliant Cheſs-reputation might injure him as a muſician: it was not conceived, apparently, that he could be a great Cheſs-player and an original compoſer at the ſame time; a calumny (he complains) was, therefore, ſpread about town, that he was not the author of the muſic he had given. To prove his capacity for original compoſition, he now undertook to ſet to muſic Congreve's Ode for St. Cecilia's Day; for it would be impoſſible, he declared, for any man living to find out old muſic that

could really agree with new words.* The Ode was performed at the Haymarket Theatre on the 31ſt of January, 1754. It was commended (according to Twiſs) by the great HANDEL. La Borde ſays, (with more particularity,) that Handel pronounced the Choruſes to be well compoſed, but that the ſtyle of the Airs ſtill left room for improvement. As Handel had become blind in 1751, and rarely went out, except to church, he could have been induced only by high regard for Philidor to have put himſelf in the way of pronouncing this frank and friendly opinion.† Under the encouragement of

* Twiſs, (*Cheſs*, vol. ii. pp. 215–17,) gives Philidor's advertiſement in the *Public Advertiſer*, dated December 9th, 1753. Philidor, ignorant, of courſe, of Engliſh Literature, had told Twiſs in 1787, as he had told La Borde in 1780, that the poetry, which he had ſet to muſic, was *Dryden's* famous Ode. When Twiſs ſhowed him this advertiſement he recognized his miſtake.

† Not one word of all this does M. Fétis believe. He does not believe, that any muſician would have been preſumptuous enough to put new muſic to Dryden's Ode after Handel. (Twiſs's lucky diſcovery anſwers this objection.) He does not believe, that Handel either commended the Choruſes or found fault with the Airs, becauſe Handel no longer left his houſe. (But Hawkins uſed to ſee him in church —and behaving himſelf very devoutly, too—during this very period.) He does not even believe, that Philidor was in London at all during his abſence from France. The publication of the *Analyſe* at London does not weigh with him to the contrary, for that publication is, to him, a pleaſant fiction and no more. Where then *was* our Philidor, ſince he was neither in London, nor Berlin, nor in any place, that was to be ſwallowed on the authority of the wretched La Borde? Fortunately,

a judgment ſo deciſive, Philidor appears to have purſued his profeſſional labours with a new ardour, that prompted him to return once more to his native country, where, to ſuch reputation as he had gained abroad, he might add the glory of a reformer.

M. Fétis can tell us with reaſonable certainty: for one M. Dunant, the celebrated Cheſs-player before mentioned, who had often played with Philidor, told M. Fétis, in 1805, that the poor young muſician had fairly abſconded, in 1745, in order to give the ſlip to his creditors, and that he lay perdu among the Dutch for nine full years, not once eſcaping from that network of dykes and canals, until he ſhowed himſelf in Paris, in 1754.

CHAPTER III.

PHILIDOR AND THE OPÉRA-COMIQUE.

PHILIDOR returned to Paris in November, 1754, after an abſence of nine years. He had left home a youth of nineteen, and returned to it a man of twenty-eight. No doubt he had ſpent a great deal of time, during theſe nine years, in playing Cheſs; but, during the two laſt years he muſt have been induſtrious as a muſician; and that he had conſtantly kept his profeſſion ſeriouſly in view is proved by his own ſtatement to La Borde, that his taſte had been formed, during his travels, by hearing the great Italian maſters,—by Gerber's account of his ſtudies in Germany,—and, above all, by the fact, that the ſtyle of the muſic, which he produced on his return, gave proof both of entire change and ſolid improvement. He found the poſt, which Campra had vacated by death ten years before, again vacant; and, in order to make good his own application for it, he produced, in the royal Chapel,

two new Motetts—one of them his *Lauda Jeruſalem;* but they were conſidered (ſays La Borde) to be "too Italian;" and the Queen, who took the French ſide in the great muſical controverſy of the day, would not ſuffer the ghoſt of dear old Campra to be diſturbed by a ſucceſſor ſo revolutionary. Under theſe circumſtances, Philidor, of courſe, loſt the chance of improving the muſic of the royal Chapel and the Cheſs-playing of the Pages; but he had won the approbation of ſuch as could venture to think differently from the Court;* and, under their encouragement, he abandoned, for the preſent, the hopeleſs attempt of intruding melodious Motetts and Anthems upon the drowſy repertory of French Chapels and Cathedrals, and entered upon a new career of muſical activity, which he ever after purſued, with that cheerful induſtry, which marks the healthy and genial mind.†

* It is with reference (as I underſtand) to the Church-muſic, which Philidor produced at this period, that Gerber cites the following paſſage from a letter of Mereaux to the Abbé Gerbert: "Philidor, one of our good compoſers of Church-muſic at Paris, conſtructs his works in the true German and Italian ſtyle, and does not, after the modern faſhion, ſacrifice either Counterpoint or Fugue, or purity of Harmony, to the mere beauty of melody."

† The "Amateurs of the Science," who (according to Twiſs) complimented Philidor on his improved ſtyle of Church-muſic, and who encouraged him to enter upon another career, were (no doubt) the leaders of the ſecond of the two then belligerent parties, deſcribed by Rouſſeau: "L'un, plus puiſſant, plus nombreux, compoſé des grands,

The fact was, that the rebuff, which he had received at Verſailles, had only helped him to diſcover his real vocation. He had every capacity, it is true, for the compoſition of Church-muſic, but, at this moment, there was other work to be done, and he had been in training—quite unconſciouſly to himſelf—as one of the principal agents for doing it. French dramatic muſic had hitherto been little better than an engrafting of declamation upon the choral harmony of the Church, or—where leſs grave entertainment was called for—a mixture of farce and

---

des riches, et des femmes, ſoutenait la muſique françaiſe; l'autre, plus vif, plus fier, plus enthouſiaſte, était compoſé des vrais connaiſſeurs, des gens à talents, des hommes de génie." (*Confeſſions*, liv. viii.) One of theſe leaders, Diderot, was probably intereſted in Philidor from the early days of the *Café de la Régence* and the receptions of La Popelinière; the other, Grimm, the friend of Diderot, was, at that time, a new-comer in Paris. André Philidor ſays, that his father devoted himſelf to the muſic of the ſtage by the advice of Rameau. Nothing could be more likely. We have already ſeen the two brought into relations with each other—and, probably, not for the firſt time—in connexion with *Les Muſes galantes* of Rouſſeau:—in fact, one cannot but ſuſpect, that Rameau aimed a ſly compliment at his young friend, when he commended the Overture. Further proof of friendly relations, that might have given occaſion for ſuch advice, may be found in the fact, that when Rameau died, in 1767, at the age of eighty-four years, and "the *Royal Academy of Muſic*, who all regarded themſelves as his children, performed a ſolemn ſervice in the Church of the Oratory, at his funeral, *Mr. Philidor* had a Maſs performed at the Church of the Carmelites, in honour of a man, whoſe talents he ſo much admired." Burney, (*Hiſtory of Muſic*, vol. iv. p. 615.)

comic ſong. Native agencies were only ſlowly working out ſome change, when, in 1752, a company of Italian burletta-ſingers—called by the French (*tout court*) *Les Bouffons*—came to Paris, and produced a lively ſenſation by their melodious and dramatic ſtyle. Jean-Jacques Rouſſeau took advantage of this ſenſation to make a violent onſet upon what the Pariſians ſtill clung to, in his celebrated *Letter on French Muſic*,* by which he immediately drew upon himſelf and his ſecond, Grimm, the attacks of a legion of exaſperated pamphleteers. Nothing could have been more to his mind, than the preſent effect and the final reſult of his ſudden aſſault. He had, indeed, confirmed the obſtinacy of the old conſervative party, but he had called forth, and given a voice to, the latent demand in the young French mind for a muſic that ſhould ſpeak, with ſtronger

* All muſical writers, from the grave Burney down to Caſtil-Blaze, appear to agree, that Rouſſeau ſaid no more than the truth, in calling French muſic "a clumſy pſalmody," whether they adopt, or not, his ingenious compariſon of its *Airs* to "a galloping cow, or a fat gooſe attempting to fly." (*La Nouvelle Héloiſe*, 2 Partie, Lettre xxiii.) The ſtyle of ſinging was worthy of the muſic. "No *voce di petto*, no true *portamento*," ſays Burney; no *creſcendo* and *diminuendo*, no departure from the monotony, which they "hugged," but one ſteady ſtrain of the voice. Hence, when Traetta wiſhed to give a certain expreſſion to the note, through which *Sofoniſba* was to utter her feelings, "dans une occaſion ſuprême," he could think of nothing better than to write over the note, for the ſinger's inſtruction, *Un urlo franceſe* (a French *ſcream.*)—Caſtil-Blaze, (*L'Opéra Italien*, p. 243.)

ſympathy, to its love of mirth well paired with melody, and of natural dramatic action united with ſkilful compoſition. Both of theſe parties triumphed, each in its own way. The French party had the Court on their ſide, and therefore found no difficulty, of courſe, in getting the poor Italians driven out of France, in 1754, by a *de par le Roi*. The reformers had already triumphed, when they awoke ſo loud an echo to their demand for a muſic more truly expreſſive and dramatic. It was neceſſary, however, that the fates ſhould ſecond their theoretic victory by furniſhing them with what theory cannot produce,—the genius of the artiſt, to create what ſhould meet thoſe aſpirations, which the ſkill of the diſputants had only been competent to call forth, but not to ſatisfy. Imperfect attempts were making to meet the exiſting demand, and they were received with good-will; but they were worthy only to be preludes to ſomething that ſhould poſſeſs the breath of true poetic life.

Such was the ſtate of things, when Philidor—whoſe return to France moſt ſignificantly bore date the very year of the *Bouffon-hegira*—was adviſed, perhaps, by others, and certainly led by the inſtincts of his own genius, to abandon his viſions of piling up heaps of *Glorias* and *Credos* in the library of chapels, royal or princely, and to betake himſelf to the muſic of the ſtage. His firſt ſtep, ſo far as we know,

was (in 1757) to approach the director of the grave and respectable Opera of the old school, with a lyric drama modestly limited to one act. But it would not do. The conservative M. Rébel knew his duty better—"he would have no *tunes* on his stage."* Then it was that Philidor quietly turned his back on these ancient respectabilities, and entered one of those homelier and more popular establishments, which had gradually grown up, from some Bartlemy-Fair booth (like that which Goethe has immortalized in the Prelude to his *Faust*) into what was now more ambitiously called the *Opéra-Comique*. Here it was —at the *Foire S. Laurent*—that those imperfect attempts were making to realize the ideal, with which Rousseau and the Italian *Bouffons* had possessed the minds of such as were fartheſt removed from the Court. A few unknown airs, composed in 1758 for some unheard of *Pélerins de la Mecque*,† revealed to

* "En 1757, il essaya de composer un acte d'opéra; mais Rébel refusa de le donner, en lui disant qu'on ne voulait point introduire d'airs dans les scènes." (*La Borde.*) M. Fétis copies these words, and then—with his customary respect for La Borde—adds "on ne sait ce que signifie cette phrase." To me the signification appears perfectly clear.

† "En 1758, ayant fait quelques airs pour les *Pélerins de la Mecque*," says La Borde. This cannot be, argues M. Fétis: "No piece of that name was played in 1758, either at the *Opéra-Comique* or at any other theatre in Paris." But La Borde's date of 1758 refers rather to Corbi's offer than to the composition which induced the offer. Again: La

the Director, Corbi—who happened not to have M. Rébel's averſion to tunes—the fact, that a rich mine of genius was offered to his hand, which he had only to work, to enrich the poor ſoil of his country's muſic. Philidor was immediately urged to undertake a regular comic opera. The reſult was the production (in 1759) of *Blaiſe le Savetier*, which—although leſs perfect than ſome of his ſubſequent works—not only achieved a decided and permanent ſucceſs for the compoſer, but alſo ſet the longed-for reform of dramatic muſic fairly afloat.* Our hero

---

Borde's memory may have deceived him as to the name of the piece, to which Philidor had made the inſignificant contribution, and yet he may have been correct as to the fact of the contribution. That there once exiſted ſuch a piece as *Les Pélerins de la Mecque* appears from Fétis himſelf: he ſays that Gluck once wrote muſic for it. Fétis adds, that the *Annales dramatiques* aſcribe to Philidor the muſic of *le Diable à quatre*—a moſt evident error, (ſays Fétis,) for the ſcore of *Blaiſe le Savetier* is inſcribed *œuvre premier*. A ſtrange argument, which would prove that Philidor had not written even the *Lauda Jeruſalem*, which Fétis acknowledges. The fact appears to be, that Philidor had felt his way by writing ſeveral inſignificant things, which he afterwards did not think worth mentioning or recollecting; and that the ſcore of *Blaiſe* was marked *œuvre premier* becauſe it was his firſt *publiſhed* work.

* It was repreſented March 9th, 1759. "The contemporary hiſtorians of the *Opéra-Comique* inform us, (ſays Fétis,) that this piece was brilliantly ſucceſsful. In it, Philidor ſhowed himſelf to be a far more ſkilful harmoniſt than the French compoſers of his day; nay, whatever ſome may ſay, there was no want of melody; but his phraſing often violates dramatic truth, and his proſody is very defective. There are, nevertheleſs, ſeveral things in *Blaiſe le Savetier*, which predicted a

had now aſcertained his true vocation, and continued to produce opera after opera, often at the rate of two a year. Of theſe I am in no condition to ſpeak, otherwiſe than in the words of thoſe who have ſtudied the ſcores. His ſecond opera (*l'Huitre et les Plaideurs*) merely ſuſtained the reputation won by *Blaiſe le Savetier*; but in thoſe, which he produced immediately afterwards, his genius (ſays Fétis) took a higher flight. In each of them, particular paſſages are ſpecified by the ſame conſummate critic as not only remarkable for ſome peculiar beauty, but alſo as even deſerving to be looked upon with wonder, conſidering the ſtate of French dramatic muſic at the time. The inſignificant *Maréchal Ferrant*, by the charm of its muſic alone, attained an unheard-of ſucceſs: nay, it had the ſingular good fortune—conſidering how ſpeedily the faſhion of operatic favourites paſſes away—to retain its place on the ſtage until ſo near, at leaſt, to the preſent day, that I have myſelf converſed with a muſical amateur who had heard it in Paris. It deſerves to be noted, alſo, that Philidor—although a ſpecial favourite of the wits, who took ſides, in the *Bouffon*-war, againſt the deteſtable French muſic—did not win their favour by

brilliant career for its author, and in particular the trio, *Le reſſort eſt, je crois, mêlé.*" This little opera was one of thoſe, which were choſen to open the new *Comédie-Italienne* with, in 1762, and continued to be a favourite for half a century.

appearing as an imitator of the Italians, any more than of the Germans. His genius was marked—according to the very decided expreſſion of M. Fétis—by a character totally different from that of any of his contemporaries. Nearly every one, even of his lighteſt comic operas, gives evidence, not merely of originality in general, but alſo of novel improvement in the details—ſome unprecedented combination of the voices, ſome expreſſive ingenuity of rhythm, ſome bold innovation in managing the ſcanty reſources of his orcheſtra. So far, in fact, was Philidor in advance of his countrymen, in his genius for inſtrumentation, that he even anticipated ſome of the effects, which are the glory of the great German ſchool. But favourite as he was—yet working for his art rather than for immediate popularity—he ſometimes failed to draw forth the uſual approbation. It was preſently ſeen, however, that what jarred upon the popular ear at firſt, were real beauties. *Tom Jones*, for example, which was at firſt fairly "damned," ſoon ſecured the moſt enthuſiaſtic recognition of its merits—merits ſo great and original, that Fétis pronounces the ſcores of *Tom Jones* and *Le Sorcier* to be the *chefs-d'œuvre* of Philidor. Even Grimm, with all his regard for Philidor, ſometimes complains of a new opera of his as "too noiſy;" for ſuch was the name given to a dramatic employment of the inſtruments, by thoſe who had

been accuſtomed to hear them only as an inexpreſſive accompaniment: Philidor was "noiſy," in ſhort, becauſe he anticipated Gluck in making his orcheſtra, what Horace would have his Chorus, one of his *dramatis perſonæ*.*

By the time that Philidor had produced his fourth opera, (*Le Jardinier et ſon Seigneur*,) his reputation was ſo high and ſo firmly eſtabliſhed, that "he reigned as King, in ſome ſort—(ſuch is the ſtrong language of Fétis)—upon the ſecond lyric theatre of France." He did not, indeed, reign alone—he ſaw without envy a brother near his throne, in the perſon of MONSIGNY. This melodious compoſer was a creation of the *Bouffons:* his dormant genius for compoſition was ſuddenly evoked, in full power, by hearing theſe foreign artiſts ſing Pergoleſe's Intermezzo, *La Serva Padrona*, between two ſtupid acts of ſome French "ſerious opera," at the *Académie Royale de Muſique*. The ſenſibility, upon which he drew for giving ſoul to his melodies, was overpowering even to himſelf; and by dint of an endowment ſo remarkable, although exceſſively weak in muſical

* Oreſte, dans *Iphigénie en Tauride*, dit: *Le calme rentre dans mon âme*, et l'air qu'il chante exprime ce ſentiment; mais l'accompagnement de cet air eſt ſombre et agité. Les muſiciens, étonnés de ce contraſte, voulaient adoucir l'accompagnement en l'exécutant; Gluck s' en irritait, et leur criait: "N' écoutez pas Oreſte: il dit qu'il eſt calme; il ment."—Mme de Staël (*De l'Allemagne*, Seconde Partie, chap. xxxii.)

ſcience and technical ſkill, he enjoyed a popularity quite equal to that of Philidor. But what could ſuch an unfurniſhed compoſer do for the advancement of the art in France, compared with Philidor —who, with a genius as original, had at his command all the reſources of ſcience, with the ſpirit of invention and improvement, that marked him for a true reformer? Between them both they ſecured for the *Opéra-Comique*—the homely *Théâtre de la Foire*—an aſcendency, which muſt have been infinitely diſguſting to the reſpectable M. Rébel of the dull and ariſtocratic *Académie*. Between the *Théâtre de la Foire* and the *Académie*, however, there could be no rivalry. Not ſo with the *Théâtre-Italien*. That eſtabliſhment was likewiſe a dealer in comic opera, and had, in fact, taken upon itſelf many airs over the homelier "Fair-Theatre." But now the tables were turned. While the Pariſians thronged to hear the original native muſic of Philidor and Monſigny, Caillot had to ſing in Italian pieces to empty benches; and, in the year 1762, the *Théâtre-Italien* was obliged to come down from its arrogant poſition, and to ſolicit and perfect an amalgamation with the leſs dignified concern of the *Foire*. The *Opéra-Comique* muſt have received the overtures of her rival with the good-humour, that ſucceſs can well afford; for, in agreeing to the name of *La Comédie-Italienne* as that of the *amalgam*, ſhe ſurrendered half

of her own honourable title. It is to be hoped, that the *Opéra-Comique* in thus merging herſelf in the *Comédie-Italienne*, did not forget that ſhe owed her triumph, more than to any other man, to her firſt compoſer, PHILIDOR.*

* The portion of all this hiſtorical matter, that is perſonal to Philidor, is derived from La Borde, Twiſs, and Fétis's *Biographie Univerſelle*. For the reſt, I have alſo uſed—beſides Burney—two excellent articles of Fétis, originally written for his celebrated *Révue Muſicale*, and afterwards introduced into his *Curioſités de la Muſique*. One is entitled *De la Muſique en France*, and the other, *Sur l'Opéra-Comique*.

CHAPTER IV.

PHILIDOR IN MIDDLE LIFE.

HAVING brought Philidor to this ſtage of his profeſſional career, it is proper to pauſe, for the purpoſe of chronicling two other events of his life, which may have been nearly as important in his eyes as the ſucceſs of his operas. Soon after the muſical cobbler had gladdened the merry Pariſians, the triumphant compoſer took to himſelf a wife; but long before that time he had beaten his old maſter. When Philidor left Paris, in 1745, although he had for ſome time been playing even games with M. de Légal, and although his own name was the one great name "to conjure with," on account of his phenomenal feats of blindfold playing, he had not ceaſed to recognize his old maſter as ſtill his maſter and ſuperior. But nine years of practice, with a great variety of players, had authorized him to look for neither ſuperior nor equal; and when, in 1755, a match was arranged between the pupil and his maſter, who was ſtill at

the height of his ſtrength, the reſult placed the crown firmly and indiſputably upon the head of Philidor. This, ſays Twiſs, was their laſt match. But whether they afterwards played together or not, in leſs ſolemn encounters, they certainly retained their old relations of friendſhip, and both continued, for many a long year, to be the two unapproachable glories of the *Café de la Régence.**

---

* Twiſs, (*Cheſs*, vol. i. p. 163,) writing in 1787, ſays: "Mr. de Légalle, who is now eighty-five years of age, is the beſt Cheſs-player in France after Mr. Philidor. The laſt match theſe gentlemen played was in 1755, when the Scholar beat his Maſter." Légal muſt, conſequently, have been born about 1702, and, at the period of the match, was fifty-three years old. Mr. Walker, intending merely to copy Twiſs, ſays in his text, "About this time he played a match at Cheſs with M. de Légalle, and had the pleaſure of conquering his old maſter," and continues, in a note: "At the reſpected age of eighty-five, M. de Légalle was ſtill the beſt player in France, always excepting Philidor." Unhappily, Mr. Walker's words (after the neceſſary change of Twiſs's "is" into "was") can be made to ſignify, that Légal was eighty-five, not at the time of Twiſs's writing (1787,) but at the date of his match with Philidor, thirty-two years earlier. Accordingly, in the wretched *Biographie* of the La Bourdonnais-Méry *Palamède*, all the glory of Philidor's victory over his maſter is taken away by the following perverſion of the Engliſh original: "Il ſe meſura alors avec ſon ancien mâitre, M. de Légal, et il fut vainqueur. *Mais M. de Légal était alors affaibli par l'âge*; il était cependant doué d'une organiſation extraordinaire, car à l'âge de quatre-vingt-cinq ans, il était encore le plus fort joueur de France après Philidor." It may be thought, however, that the *Palamède* is ſupported in its aſſertion, that Légal was "weakened by age" at fifty-three, by the words of the Abbé Roman in his poem

On the 13th of February, 1760, Philidor married Angélique-Henriette-Eliſabeth Richer, daughter of a reſpectable compoſer, and ſiſter of three clever muſicians, one of whom was long at the head of his profeſſion as a ſinger and teacher of ſinging. The wife of Philidor, born in 1736, was alſo an excellent muſician, and is ſpoken of by Gerber as ſtill, ten years after her marriage, in high reputation as a ſinger at the *Concert Spirituel.** It is a ſound maxim,

---

Les Échecs, which is ſaid, in Couvret's note to the Preface, to have been written in the year 1760:—

> Mais Philidor eſt encore dans cet âge
> Où l'on jouit de toute ſa vigueur;
> Légal du temps éprouve le dommage—
> Froide vieilleſſe! ainſi donc ta langueur
> Nous ravit tout, et génie et courage.
> *Les Échecs*, chant iv.

But, in the firſt place, it is at any rate idle to ſpeak of a man as already enfeebled or chilled in his Cheſs-powers at fifty-three, when the ſame man was able to beat everybody but Philidor at eighty-five; and, in the ſecond place, the Poet was ſpeaking of Philidor and Légal, with reference—not to the match in 1755—but to a period at leaſt fifteen years later, when the former was about forty-five, and the latter about ſixty-nine—the fourth canto of *Les Échecs* having been written more than ten years after the firſt.

* The *Concert Spirituel* (ſo often ſpoken of in French muſical hiſtory) was inſtituted in 1725 at the ſuggeſtion of Anne Danican-Philidor, (a half-brother of our own François-André,) for the purpoſe of furniſhing an entertainment of religious and inſtrumental muſic, at times when it was not permitted to open the Opera-houſes. The concerts were given in a hall of the Tuilleries. (See Fétis "*Sur le Concert Spirituel*" in his *Curioſités de la Muſique.*)—[Gerber's authority was Burney, who heard

abundantly ſuſtained by experience, that the happieſt marriages are thoſe, in which the diſpoſition and mental conſtitution of each party forms—not the counterpart—but the complement to that of the other.* Philidor's marriage appears, from the ſcanty but deciſive teſtimony we poſſeſs, to have been emphatically of this kind. He was rather cheerfully quiet and ſerious; ſhe was gay and lively. She, again, is ſpoken of as brilliant and witty in converſation; poor Philidor hardly knew if there be ſuch a thing as wit.† There are other things, however, quite as ſatisfactory, in the long run, as wit and

---

Madame Philidor ſing a Motett of her huſband's compoſition, at the *Concert Spirituel*, on the 15th of June, 1770.—*Preſent State of Muſic in France and Italy*, p. 26.]

* You may depend upon it, (ſays Coleridge,) that a ſlight contraſt of character is very material to happineſs in marriage.—Sympathy conſtitutes friendſhip; but in love there is a ſort of antipathy, or oppoſing paſſion. Each ſtrives to be the other, and both together make up one whole. (*Table Talk.*)

† The only *bon mot* recorded of him appears to have been uttered very ſeriouſly, without the leaſt thought of being witty. "One day, he entered the houſe at the moment when two of his ſons, of about fourteen and ſixteen, were trying their ſtrength at Cheſs. He looked at their game, and after following it for two or three moves, ſaid to his wife, *Ma chère amie*, our children have fairly ſucceeded in making Cheſs a game of chance." (André Philidor.)—Twiſs, (*Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. p. 112,) ſays, that Philidor never taught Cheſs to any of his numerous children. André's anecdote ſhows, however, that Philidor by no means prohibited his children from learning Cheſs, although he may never have choſen to teach them himſelf.

repartee. Philidor's letters prove, that he felt a lively intereſt in the current topics of the day, and that he could expreſs himſelf in reference to them with clearneſs and eaſe. There is good reaſon, therefore, to believe, that his converſation, although not brilliant, was every way agreeable and even intereſting. It appears always to have exhibited that ſimple frankneſs, which he inherited from his mother. The confidence, which ſuch a characteriſtic impreſſes upon us, that we are talking with a perfectly ſtraightforward and ſincere man, is an ample compenſation for the abſence of thoſe cold diſplays of talent, "where no heart is." The Memoirs of Grétry inform us, how perfectly *he* found the character and conduct of Philidor to correſpond with his very agreeable ſimplicity of language and manners. His wife appears ſometimes to have made a little merry with ſome of his peculiarities, but he could have underſtood nothing of her mirth but the affection it covertly ſignified, for by no poſſibility could he be made to comprehend a joke.* The

* A merry relation of his, for the purpoſe of putting this negative quality of Philidor's to the proof, one day gravely expreſſed the wiſh that he were the owner of a carriage, that he might ſit at his window and ſee himſelf ride by. Philidor reflected a moment, until he had analyzed the "poſition," and then remarked, "What you have ſaid there, my dear friend, is quite inconſiderate and fooliſh:—you could not be at your window and in your carriage at the ſame moment; conſequently, it would be impoſſible to ſee yourſelf ride by." (Lardin.)

ſincerity of their mutual attachment, his devotion to her and to his children, the amiable and artleſs words and ways, in which he was wont to expreſs that attachment and devotion, are not only preſerved in the traditions of his deſcendants, but are alſo evinced by the unpretending letters which he wrote home from London in later years. She reminds him, thirty years after their marriage, of the happy 13th of February, 1760; and he thanks her in return, and renews the declaration of his unabated and tender affection, in terms which make this one homely letter worth more, in its way, than volumes of Madame de Sévigné.*

Another joke of this kind, (among the André Philidor and Lardin anecdotes,) is ſuited excluſively to French manners, and may as well, therefore, be given in the original: Richer, ſon beau-frère, vient le voir un matin et d'aſſez bonne heure: il le trouve encore couché, et s'écrie en entrant: "Comment, ma ſoeur! Je vous trouve couché, avec M. Philidor!"—"Mais, mon ami, c'eſt ma femme," répond Philidor; et cette réponſe, Richer la lui a ſait faire plus de cinquante fois dans le même à-propos.

* Ce 23 Février, 1790.—Ma très-chère et très-bonne amie, j'ai reçu tes deux lettres, et je te remercie de ton reſſouvenir du jour, ou nous nous ſommes liées pour la vie. Je n'aurai rien de plus preſſé que de ſonger à toi, ainſi qu'à nos enfans. Tu embraſſeras deux fois notre chère fille pour moi, et tu lui diras, que ſi elle veut me donner des preuves de ſon amitié, ce ſera de ne point negliger ſon piano-forte. Je te ſouhaite une auſſi bonne ſanté que celle dont je jouis; et je te jure de nouveau, que je t'aime auſſi tendrement, que le premier jour que nous nous ſommes connus; et c'eſt avec ces ſentimens que je ſuis, pour la vie, votre très-cher et très-tendre ami, A. D. Philidor.—[I am

The parties thus happily brought together were not deſtined to paſs their wedded life in ſolitude. Sons and daughters were born to them—although not on quite ſo patriarchal a ſcale as the biographers would have us believe. When Twiſs viſited Philidor, and made the acquaintance of Madame Philidor, at Paris, in 1783, he fell, by ſome chance, into the ſtrange deluſion, that the then living progeny of his hoſt and hoſteſs amounted to nineteen *enfans terribles;* and Mr. Walker has added to the terrors of ſuch a brood by printing the NINETEEN in capitals. But there were really only five ſons and two daughters in all; and of theſe one of either ſex died in early childhood:—the reſt ſurvived their father.*

tempted to add the cloſing paragraph of another letter of Philidor's (of which the autograph original is in my poſſeſſion) under date of London, May 17th, 1787. (It begins: *Ma très-chère et charmante amie.*) * * * * L'eſpérance que j'ai de pouvoir partir dans trois ſemaines me fait un ſi grand plaiſir, que je m'ennuie beaucoup moins. Enfin, ma chère bonne amie, ce ſera pour moi une fête audeſſus de toute expreſſion, lorſque j'aurai le bonheur de te revoir, t'embraſſer, et te jurer que je ne ceſſerai jamais de t'aimer, et d'être pour la vie ton très-cher et très-bon ami, A. D. PHILIDOR.]

* His eldeſt ſon, André-Joſeph-Hélène, died June 6th, 1845, in his eighty-third year. Lardin ſays he ſurvived all his brothers. Yet Quérard (*Supercheries*, tom. iii. p. 459) mentions another ſon, Auguſte Danican, (who would appear to have dropt the ancient *ſobriquet*,) known as a royaliſt general. He was condemned to death, but eſcaped, and died in Holſtein, in December, 1848, eighty-five years old—which would make him born in the ſame year with André. I ſuſpect, therefore, that there is ſome miſtake here. [According to the new *Biogra-*

What ſlight record we have of this period indicates, that Philidor fell at once quietly into ſuch a daily routine of induſtrious occupation at home, and quiet amuſement at his favourite *Café*, as comported with his duty to his family and his profeſſion, and with the neceſſity of a relaxation ſuited to the character of his mind. The morning appears to have been devoted to compoſition, which he purſued in the moſt entire abſorption and abſence of mind, accompanying his work with a perpetual twiſting and turning of his body and limbs, which his pleaſant wife uſed to deſcribe by ſaying, that her huſband was playing the ſilk-worm. On finiſhing his genial taſk, and beginning to dreſs for his walk to *La Régence*, the thing was ſometimes found impracticable for lack of garments. If a poor muſician had come in upon him, during theſe hours of *robe de chambre* abſtraction, the extreme kindheartedneſs and abſence of Philidor knew no reſiſtance to the appeal

---

phie Générale, Quérard was certainly in error—General Danican was not a ſon of Philidor's.]—The name only of another ſon is mentioned as an interlocutor in a dialogue, illuſtrative of Philidor's abſence of mind. "Frédéric!—Papa!—Es tu là?—Oui, papa.—Tu n'eſt pas donc ſorti?—Non, papa.—Eh bien! tu vas chez Marmontel, etc."—Philidor's only daughter, Elyſe, beautiful and lively, like her mother, at twenty-eight married Pradher, then only ſeventeen, who became afterwards a diſtinguiſhed profeſſor at the *Conſervatoire*. She died in Auguſt, 1825, at the age of fifty. She was the only muſician of his children:—none of them had any ſkill in Cheſs.

for charity, and precluded all diſcrimination of means. He gave whatever he could lay his hands on—coat, hat, ſhoes; and when coin could not be found in the pocket of his *culotte*, he could be prevented from giving the garment itſelf only by the watchful interpoſition of a ſenſible maid-ſervant, to whom Madame Philidor committed the guardianſhip of the dear ſilk-worm while plying his work.

The morning taſk completed, he ſeems to have gone regularly to the *Caſé de la Régence*, and always to have taken his ſeat at the ſame Cheſs-table, over which his portrait afterwards continued to hang, until the old building itſelf was finally demoliſhed, in the barbarous ſpirit of modern improvement. At the board, Philidor became as completely abſorbed as he had been at his deſk; and his meditations on a difficult poſition were accompanied by the ſame gyration of the body and the ſame twiſting of the limbs.* Nor do ſuch meditations appear to have borrowed any ſolemnity from ſilence. The ſtranger, who approached—and not without awe—the table of PHILIDOR, at ſome critical moment of the game, might be amazed to hear the profound Maſter of "thoughtful Cheſs" murmuring ludicrouſly disjointed propoſitions, that gave little evi-

* Lardin (from André Philidor), and St. Amant, on the authority of a contemporary of Philidor's—the Chevalier de Barneville, I ſuppoſe, who died in 1842, at the age of ninety-four.

dence of any ſevere logical proceſs going on in his mind.* Such ſilk-worm peculiarities and ſuch effuſions of abſtractedneſs were, no doubt, regarded as reſpectfully here, as they were tenderly at home:—Philidor was always and everywhere an object of reſpect, even in a circle, that embraced not a few of thoſe names, wherewith all Europe had already rung, or was ſoon to ring, from ſide to ſide. For it was in this ſame *Café* that Voltaire liked to practiſe his favourite game, whenever he lived at Paris, while Jean-Jacques laboured perſeveringly, but in vain, to advance one ſtep beyond his firſt eſſay, when he gave the Rook to Bagueret. Here, at a later day, our own Franklin diffuſed the ſunſhine of his ever clear and cheerful mind in the midſt of the ſtorm of noiſe and talk, with which Frenchmen will ſurround themſelves, even while playing Cheſs; and Philidor

* Sévelinges (*Biographie Univerſelle*, art. PHILIDOR) relates an anecdote of La Garde's taking a friend to ſee his idol play Cheſs, and being obliged to account for his ſtrangely fooliſh talk by crying out that it was all *genius*. This trifling anecdote is repeated by other writers, with ſeveral variations, the worſt of which is poor André's, who—being a *bon vivant*, and not a Cheſs-player—miſunderſtood Sévelinges's word "table," and wrote his father down as talking like a fool at the dinner-table (*un repas*). But Sévelinges appears merely to have been illuſtrating a habit—which Philidor had in common with many good players—of unconſciouſly talking any kind of nonſenſe, while abſorbed in the ſtudy of a difficult poſition. The newſpaper notices of his celebrated blindfold games in London mention, accordingly, his indulging himſelf in *pleaſantries* during his ſevere mental labour.

had not yet ceaſed to ſit at his wonted table, when Maximilian Robeſpierre had begun to mingle meditations of murder and regicide with combinations for mating the King.

The imagination ſo readily pictures to itſelf the appearance and conduct, in any ſituation, of a man ſo very natural and ſimple, ſo amiable and ſo courteous, that we do not at firſt reflect, how all but deſtitute we are of materials for continuing the hiſtory of Philidor's "familiar day." We are left to gueſs, with what deepfelt enjoyment he ſat down to the ſimple meal, that awaited him, on his return from the *Café*, by the longing he expreſſed, while a daily gueſt at the tables of the great in London, for his plain *pot-au-feu* at home. His evenings were doubtleſs ſpent, for the moſt part, at the Opera-houſe, which was, in ſome ſort, his own; but how he deported himſelf there, in the midſt of the muſicians and compoſers, his friends and brothers, can only be inferred from what we happen to know of his habitual feelings and conduct towards them under other circumſtances. When Grétry, for example, came to Paris in 1767, with all his great reputation ſtill to make, he found Philidor not only frank and cordial —incapable of jealouſy towards a youthful competitor for profeſſional honours—but alſo active and ſelf-renunciant in his friendſhip. He exerted himſelf warmly to induce the prime poet of the Opera

to give Grétry the *libretto* juſt compoſed for himſelf; and when the conſent, at firſt granted, was afterwards withdrawn, he invited Grétry to unite his muſic and his name with his own, now ſo celebrated, in *Le Jardinier de Sidon.** So his family beheld him with awe, ſome years later, reading the ſcore of Sacchini's ſucceſsful *Œdipe à Colone* with a ſympathetic emotion, that expreſſed itſelf in ſobs and tears. The only picture we have of him, in the theatre itſelf, among thoſe to whom was intruſted the execution of his productions, is certainly far leſs ſolemn, but quite as characteriſtic:—it repreſents him in company with his handſome André, at the moment of meeting, behind the ſcenes, a certain pretty Opera-ſinger, (Mademoiſelle Colombe,) who had condeſcended to become the boy's "firſt love"—the father bowing to the ground before her, and politely thanking her for having taken the raw youth into training, with the moſt innocent unconſciouſneſs of the ſtrange confuſion, with which he was overwhelming both lad and lady, by taking ſuch parental cognizance of their little private arrangements.†

---

* Grétry, (*Mémoires*, tome i. p. 428.)

† "Ah! Mademoiſelle, je vous remercie de vous être chargée de mon jeune gaillard; j'eſpère que vous en ſerez contente."—He aſtounded another of his hopeful ſons one day, at dinner, by pulling out his watch, and ſaying, with the moſt perfect *bonhomie:* "Partez, Frédéric; allez mon fils; il ne faut jamais faire attendre les dames."

To complete, as far as poſſible, this very imperfect ſketch of Philidor in middle life, it is proper to mention one or two honours conferred upon him, with ſome account of his ſecond attempt to approach the ſame conſervative *Académie*, over which M: Rébel had preſided as Director.

The honour, which Philidor appears to have ſet the higheſt value upon, was "thruſt upon him," like Falſtaff's, by circumſtances. He had two unmarried ſiſters, who very ſenſibly provided for themſelves by going into buſineſs. But in thoſe days, no one could practice even the art and myſtery of making millinery without being recognized, as a *maſter* in the craft, by ſome appropriate guild. All guilds, however, had ſome reaſon, good or bad, for excluding women from maſterſhip, yet permitted them to be repreſented by one of the rival ſex. Philidor, therefore, for his ſiſters' ſake, very eagerly enrolled himſelf in the confraternity of Mercers—nobody (ſays his deſcendant) can well gueſs his reaſon for the choice; and thenceforth nothing gave him ſo much delight as to ſign himſelf PHILIDOR, *Marchand Mercier:*—nay, when he furniſhed his name for the baptiſmal certificates of his children, it was with this mercantile appendage.

To this period of his life we may, perhaps, refer the peculiar honour, which he received from the good city of Paris—that of having his buſt ordered

of Pajou. The work was executed in *terra cotta*, and was pronounced by his family to be an admirable likeneſs. It was afterwards preſented by the city to Madame Philidor.* If the portrait in the Muſeum of Verſailles be a work of the laſt century, that too, judging by the age repreſented, muſt belong to the ſame epoch. In that caſe, it was probably an honour conferred by his Sovereign, as the other had been by the city.†

The King took another occaſion to diſtinguiſh him, in connection with his art. The ſucceſs which he had gained at the *Opéra-Comique* had hitherto produced no effect upon the conſervative *Académie*, or *Opéra-Françaiſe*:—there the old French muſic ſtill reigned triumphant. He now, in 1766, had the boldneſs to aim at extending the work of reform, which had been ſo popular at the *Foire St. Laurent*, to the grave ſcene of the more ariſtocratic Opera. With this view, he compoſed, no longer a Comic but a Tragic Opera, *Ernelinde Princeſſe de Norvège*,

* Having never ſeen any caſt or engraving of this buſt, I can only conjecture, that it may have been executed during the middle period of his life. Pajou was made Profeſſor in the Academy of Painting and Sculpture in 1767, but lived until 1809.

† This portrait was lithographed for the third volume of St. Amant's *Palamède*. M. Alliey, in the firſt of his intereſting articles entitled *Muſée de l'Échiquier*, (*Palamède*, tome v. p. 404,) ſpeaks of it as admirable; but, unfortunately, he neither gives the name of the painter, nor the date of the portrait.

"without mythology," (ſays Twiſs,) "and with recitative, after the Italian manner, intermixed with airs." He could hardly have expected any greater ſucceſs than he actually met with. He informed Twiſs, that the Nobility, who were the laſt and moſt bigoted partiſans of the old French muſic, caballed againſt him; that the actors and ſingers did their beſt to ruin the effect of the piece; and that the orcheſtra played their worſt.* Yet Philidor's muſic had force enough to make head againſt all this. His opera was performed for eight ſucceſſive nights; and the King himſelf was ſo well pleaſed with it, (ſays our author,) that he privately rewarded the compoſer with a penſion of twenty-five *louis d'or* from his privy purſe.†

* Philidor did not ſay this, without grounds, merely to cover his partial failure—Gluck had to encounter preciſely the ſame difficulties, when he came to Paris, in 1774, to bring out his *Iphigénie*—difficulties, which to him alſo would have been inſurmountable, if he had not had the powerful ſupport of the Queen, his former pupil, Marie Antoinette. Even then, it took ſix full months of rehearſal to "break in" the perverſe ſingers and muſicians. All Paris daily thronged to ſee the proceſs as performed by the frightful old German, who firſt took off coat and wig, then armed himſelf with a ſtout cudgel for a *bâton*, and proceeded to drill, ſcold, threaten, and demonſtrate, until even his Herculean frame could ſtand no more for the day. What could poor Philidor do with a company, that could be made to do juſtice to his muſic only by a breaking-in like this?

† Of the repreſentation of this Opera, La Borde ſays, it was the epoch of a muſical reform at the *Opéra-Françaiſe*, and that it was the

One other piece of his ſhould be mentioned—the comic opera, *Le Sorcier**—becauſe it is in reference to it, that the charge of plagiariſm has been made againſt Philidor—and that, too, by a mean countryman of his own. M. de Sévelinges, in the article PHILIDOR, of the well-known *Biographie Univerſelle*, affirms, that our compoſer transferred to *Le Sorcier*, note for note, a remarkable air of Gluck's *Orfeo*, which had been long before repreſented in

---

model of a new ſtyle, which foreign compoſers (I ſuppoſe he means Gluck) had only imitated after Philidor. Fétis ſpeaks of *Ernelinde* as containing beautiful choruſes, and effects of inſtrumentation, which have ſince been imitated by others. It was with a view, I ſuppoſe, to ſome of theſe effects, that Philidor changed the compoſition of the orcheſtra by introducing the novelty of another double-baſs.—Burney, (*Hiſtory*, vol. iv. p. 617,) writing in 1789, ſays: "In 1770, the ſerious opera had not advanced a ſtep towards perfection, or even variety, in five years time, if the Opera of *Ernelinde*, by Philidor, be excepted, in which that ingenious compoſer quitted the ancient opera ſtyle of his country, accelerated the recitatives, and terminated his ſcenes with many excellent airs, *à l'Italienne*." Scudo ſays, in 1858, "The choruſes of *Ernelinde* are ſtill celebrated"—one of them (*Jurons ſur ces glaives ſanglants*) having been incorporated into the current oratorio of *Saül*. (Caſtil-Blaze, *De l'Opéra*, tome ii. p. 130.)

* According to Caſtil-Blaze, *Le Sorcier*, in other reſpects a *chef-d'œuvre*, contained an amuſing ſpecimen of Philidor's comic humour:—"Dix ans après, [he is ſpeaking of the *Bouffon* war,] le 2 janvier, 1764, Philidor égayait les habitués de la *Comédie-Italienne* en leur préſentant la caricature du chant français de cette époque. Dans la ſcène d'évocation du *Sorcier*, Caillot imitait les acteurs de l'Opéra d'une manière très-plaiſante." (*L'Opéra-Italien*, p. 150.)

Italy. A ſtill meaner Frenchman adds the aſſertion, that Philidor had contrived to get poſſeſſion of the ſcore of the *Orfeo.** M. Fétis more than makes up for all his ſkepticiſm, by his trenchant expoſure of this reckleſs attack upon the probity of Philidor. His anſwer is, *Firſt*, Gluck's *Orfeo* was played, not in Italy at all, but at Vienna, in July, 1764, while Philidor's *Sorcier* was played at Paris, on the 2d day of January, *ſix months earlier*, and, *Secondly*, M. Fétis had read the ſcores of both pieces, and had found that there was not a ſingle phraſe common to both.† This ſame Gluck was the one, who was deſtined afterwards to perfect that reform of the ſerious opera, in which Philidor's ſucceſs had been only partial; yet ſo far was either of theſe great men from any envy or jealouſy of the other, that, upon ſome occaſion, when Gluck, being obliged to abſent himſelf from Paris, needed the aſſiſtance of ſome competent and friendly brother in the art to ſuperintend the repetition of this ſame *Orphée*, (in

* [There appears to have been another and an earlier calumniator in the caſe. According to M. Fétis, the charge of plagiariſm originated with Favart, the dramatic poet.]

† "C'eſt cependant (writes M. Fétis with juſt indignation) de cette anecdote que l'auteur de la *Biographie univerſelle et portative des contemporains* eſt parti pour refuſer le génie de la muſique à Philidor, et le repréſenter comme un homme qui ne vivait que de plagiats, tandis que le talent de ce compoſiteur a un caractère abſolument différent de tous ſes contemporains."

its French dreſs,) he left his ſcore in the hands of Philidor, who directed the rehearſals with as much attention and intereſt as if the piece had been his own.*

* Such is the only way in which I can make anything ſatisfactory out of André Philidor's ſtatement, that his father ſuperintended the rehearſals of the *Orphée* in 1774—the very year of Gluck's firſt arrival in Paris, when he certainly brought out his Opera under his own eye. But between 1774 and 1779 Gluck once, at leaſt, (and probably more than once,) returned to Vienna; and André's ſtory appears to be in *ſome* ſhape entitled to belief: *Firſt*, becauſe it is a family tradition, not likely to be entirely without foundation, and, *Secondly*, becauſe it contains one fact, in common with the ſecond of the two ſtanders, viz., the poſſeſſion of Gluck's ſcore by Philidor.

CHAPTER V.

PHILIDOR AND THE LONDON CHESS-CLUB.

FOR nearly twenty years had Philidor been thus purſuing the even tenor of his profeſſional labours, when, in 1772, the current of his remaining years received a new direction. "This year," (ſays Mr. Twiſs,) "he came to England, and paſſed a month with his friends." It ſeems, however, hard to believe, that Philidor, at the age of forty-ſix—after the wandering ſpirit of his youth had been, for eighteen years, thoroughly laid and ſmothered by wife and children and profeſſional ſucceſs—ſhould have ſuddenly undertaken, of his own accord, to viſit a ſcene, from which the moſt of his old friends, ſtout Sir Abraham, dark Stamma, and their contemporaries, muſt have long ſince diſappeared.* It is

* Sir Abraham Janſſen died, Feb. 19th, 1765, at Paris, where he appears to have been living for ſeveral years. [Twiſs's date of 1763 is probably not ſo much a miſtake, as a miſprint.] Some account of him may be found in Nichols's *Anecdotes*, (vol. iii. pp. 406–11.)—When

far more likely, that Philidor was drawn from his regular and induſtrious way of life by a ſpecial and preſſing invitation. A younger generation of amateurs had grown up in England, that ſeemed diſpoſed to aim at being "better than their fathers." In 1770, a new Club, at the Salopian Coffee-houſe, had ſuperſeded the heroic rendezvous of Old Slaughter. Count Brühl, on whoſe boyiſh path we have ſometimes fancied that the light of Philidor's countenance may have fallen in 1752, had now been for ſeveral years reſident in England, where, in 1767, he had married an Engliſh wife.* Now, we know that he occaſionally viſited Paris;† and we may be certain, that he did not viſit Paris without viſiting all that made Paris Paris to a Cheſs-player—the *Café de la Régence* and Philidor. May it not, then,

Stamma publiſhed his *Noble Game of Cheſs*, in 1745, he informed the public, that "no Copies o the Book were genuine, but ſuch as were ſign'd by him." The copies, which have this ſignature are very rare. It may, therefore, be inferred, that Stamma died pretty ſoon after the publication of this edition—or, at any rate, long before the whole of it had been diſpoſed of.

* John Maurice, Count Brühl, Envoy of the Elector of Saxony, at London, was born Dec. 20th, 1736, and died Feb. 22d, 1809, aged 72. He would, therefore, have been about fourteen or fifteen in 1752, when I have ventured to think a viſit of Philidor's to Dreſden poſſible. According to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, on the 6th day of July, 1767, Count Brühl was married to the Counteſs-dowager of Egremont.

† In his Letter to Daines Barrington (*Archæologia*, vol. ix.) he uſes the expreſſion "during my laſt viſit to Paris."

be a moſt reaſonable, and by no means a fanciful, conjecture, that the invitation of Count Brühl, in behalf of the enthuſiaſtic amateurs whom he repreſented, had ſomething to do with this "coming to England and paſſing a month with his friends?"*

Be this, however, as it may, the preſence of Philidor ſeems to have renewed the demonſtration, that there was ſomething in his character, independent of his talents, that had a peculiar charm for the Engliſh mind. It was the league between Kwaſind and Chibiabos again. The "very ſtrong" Engliſhman loved and reſpected the "gentle" Frenchman, doubly rich in faculties, which he bore ſo meekly—amiable in ſociety, but with a ſingle heart for his loved ones at home—generous, yet ſelf-denying and provident, and of a life ſtainleſs in its purity and integrity. A month's enjoyment of his preſence, ſo agreeable and ſo inſtructive, proved to be what the Engliſh players would not willingly be without:—having had it once, they wanted it again and always. Now, what the Engliſh like they will have; and could they have got poſſeſſion of Philidor, with his

* [Philidor's intereſt in the Cheſs-playing circles of London may have been kept alive by two other cauſes, namely, the continued preſence of Sir Abraham Janſſen, at Paris, and the occaſional viſits of other native amateurs—for his acquaintance with Engliſhmen lay very much with thoſe who were beſt able, and quite likely, to indulge themſelves in a trip to the moſt attractive of foreign capitals.]

golden mines of Chefs-ſkill, in no other way, I make no doubt they would have *annexed* him by the ſtrong hand, like ſome Scinde or Oude of remote Hindoſtan; but fortunately it occurred to them to try what liberal offers would do, along with permanent arrangements for making thoſe offers effectual. In 1774, therefore, they formed a new Club in St. James Street, under the very ſhadow of the Palace. The number of members was limited to a hundred:—the terms of ſubſcription, three guineas. The evidence of ſome ſtrong impulſe and of ſome ſpecial object, in forming this Club, may be found in the character of its original members. It was no mere private aſſociation of quiet Chefs-players: ſtatesmen, warriors, men of letters—all crowded forward to enter its ranks; inſomuch that when Gibbon came to town, reſolved to play a part in high life, he joined the new Chefs-club as one of the "*faſhionable Clubs*." One noble lady, Dr. Franklin's Mrs. Howe,* ſtood by the ſide of a Church dignitary, the Biſhop of Durham,† at the head of a liſt, on which

* An intereſting account of this lady, of whoſe "diſcretion and excellent underſtanding" Dr. Franklin formed ſo high an opinion, may be found in Mr. Fiſke's paper on the "Chefs-life of Benjamin Franklin," in the *Book of the Firſt American Chefs-Congreſs*, pp. 331–39.

† The "Golden See" was at this time held by John Egerton, father of the Hon. Francis Egerton, (afterwards Duke of Bridgewater,) in whoſe houſe, at Paris, (in 1807,) the curious conſultation-games were

—beſides uncounted Dukes, Marquiſſes, and Earls —were found the hiſtorical names of Charles James Fox and Lord Mansfield, of Erſkine, Wedderburne, and the Marquis of Rockingham,—of Elliot, the defender of Gibraltar,—of Fraſer, who met a ſoldier's death, and Burgoyne, who underwent a ſoldier's laſt humiliation, at American Saratoga.

The firſt ſtep of the new Club was to provide, that a ſubſcription ſhould be annually made amongſt its members, to be offered to Philidor, as an inducement to him to ſpend the *Seaſon* of every year in London—a period which at that time covered the four months from February to June.* There could have been no reſiſting ſo liberal an offer, made by ſuch men, actuated by feelings ſo friendly and reſpectful. His acceptance of the offer would not of neceſſity interfere ſeriouſly with his labours, or leſſen his emoluments, as a muſician, while it would be materially increaſing his income at a moſt opportune moment, when the age of his ſons muſt have begun to demand increaſed expenditure on his part. Theſe conſiderations were weighty enough to overcome the reluctance which he muſt have felt, at ſeparating himſelf, for ſo large a part of every year, from a

played, in connection with which the name of Deschapelles is firſt heard of.—(*Cheſs Monthly*, vol. ii. pp. 58–59.)

* This is aſcertained from his letters. The earlieſt date is in February; in one he ſays he cannot be in Paris until the 20th of June.

home, to which he clung ſo tenderly; and, in 1775, he ſpent his firſt ſeaſon in London, under the new arrangement.

There are circumſtances which tend to ſhow, that the conſiderate kindneſs of Philidor's Engliſh friends did not end with providing him a ſalary. The publication of the new edition of the *Analyſe*, in 1777, appears to have been promoted by them, with a view to put into his hands an extraordinary ſum at the beginning of his connection with the Club. The edition itſelf was dedicated "to the very illuſtrious and honourable Members of the Club," and the name of every member, without exception, appears upon the Liſt of Subſcribers. The perſonal exertion of the members to enlarge the Liſt is evinced by the character of the names which were added to their own. We can fancy the Scotch Duke of Athol getting the name of the Scotch Duke of Argyle, and Charles Fox bantering Lord North into putting down his guinea. Gibbon, with his courtly ſmile and the tap on his ſnuff-box, may have won the ſupport of Lady Di Beauclerk; and the activity of dear Mrs. Howe ſhall have (in my mind) the credit of ſo many of the fifty noble ladies, as did not ſubſcribe in obedience to their huſbands. As the French names do not exceed fifty—although theſe form a brilliant array—the inference is a very clear one, that the edition was eſpecially an

affair of the Engliſh Club, and connected with their arrangements for the perſonal emolument and gratification of the author.*

Of the habits and occupations of Philidor, during theſe annual reſidences in London, we catch no glimpſe, until about fifteen years after the arrangement had gone into operation. Eight familiar letters, written between the years 1787 and 1790, enable us to form a pretty clear idea of the amiable old man's day in London, and to conjecture what it may have been, when greener years and better health permitted him to accompliſh more. We find him, at paſt ſixty, in reſpectable lodgings,† devoting a portion of his time—probably the morning hours, as at home—to muſical compoſition,‡ or amuſing himſelf with a walk and goſſip with friends, as every Frenchman, and moſt reaſonable men, will do. He meets the Abbé Vogler, and they try a new piano;

* There were two hundred and eighty-three ſubſcribers, and three hundred and ſixty-ſeven copies, in all. The French names are under fifty. Among them are thoſe of *Monſieur*, (afterwards Louis XVIII.,) who was ſubſequently the head of the Pariſian Cheſs-Club,—of Philidor's old maſter, Légal,—of Dukes, Marquiſſes, Counts, and Marſhals many,—and of Marmontel, Raynal, Diderot, and Voltaire.

† "Notre mylord Goy eſt à Londres, et loge dans la même maiſon que moi." (*Letter*, Feb. 20th, 1788.)

‡ "J'avance dans mon ouvrage, et je ſuis très-content de mes idées. —Je compte que je reviendrai, avec tous mes brouillons de la totalité de mon ouvrage: j'ai la plus grande envie de prouver que la vieilleſſe ne m'a pas encore éteint le génie." (*Letter*, April 22d, 1789.)

he falls in with M. de Calonne, who preſſes him to join him at dinner.* When not thus appropriated by ſome ſpecial invitation, he goes where he has a ſtanding engagement—to his friend, Count Brühl's. Then both go to the Club, where Philidor finds his regular occupation.† Occaſionally, he brings out before a London audience ſome of his compoſitions, and then he miſſes the help and voice of his faithful Richer.‡ At another time, we hear of him at a party, where admiſſion could be gained only by talent and character.§ And ſometimes, there is

* *Letters*, February and March, 1790.

† "Je ne m'amuſe que lorſque je ſonge à toi: je n'ai point encore été à aucun ſpectacle. Je me promène le matin, et vais dîner chez le Comte de Brühl, et de là à notre Club. Voilà, à peu près, la vie que je mène." (*Letter*, Feb. 20th, 1788.)

‡ "Mon *Carmen* a été très-bien reçu, mais Richer me manquait." (*Letter*, June 3d, 1788.)—"J'ai reçu mon *Te Deum*—je vais chercher à pouvoir en faire uſage." (*Letter*, March 20th, 1790.) Gerber (*Hiſtoriſch Biographiſches Lexicon*) ſays, that Philidor uſually gave a Concert of his vocal compoſitions during each of his London viſits, and that (*as they ſay*) he uſed to gain from each concert *two hundred guineas*. Of courſe, an exaggeration.—I may add, that as Philidor played no inſtrument, he depended upon his wife and her brothers—Louis Richer, the teacher of ſinging, eſpecially—for trying the effect of any vocal pieces, which he happened to be compoſing.

§ Mr. Staunton tells the following anecdote, in Tomlinſon's delightful *Cheſs-Player's Annual for* 1856, (p. 160.) "Madame d'Arblay (Miſs Burney that was, you know) once told me, that Philidor was at one of her parties; and when ſhe aſked him to play at Cheſs, he replied: 'Madame, I am not prepared.'—'How ſo? I thought, Mon-

reaſon to think, the ſolitarineſs of his London reſidence was relieved by the ſociety of his wife and daughter.*

We have no means of aſcertaining, with exactneſs, the income which Philidor derived from his engagement with the London Club. It does not appear whether the ſubſcription, which was annually renewed, was always for the ſame amount.† At

---

ſieur Philidor, you were always ready to play at Cheſs." "Pardon, Madame; when I play at Cheſs, I do not dine until I have done playing, and to-day I have already dined."—Miſs Burney did not marry General d'Arblay until two years before Philidor's death. It is, therefore, uncertain, whether "her parties" were given at her own, or at her father's, houſe, and whether ſhe invited Philidor as a diſtinguiſhed compatriot of her huſband's, or as an ornament to the profeſſion of her father. In any caſe, admiſſion to her parties was an honour.—As to the anecdote itſelf, I would obſerve: Philidor, as we have ſeen, did all his playing at the Club *after* his dinner with Count Brühl. It is, therefore, clear that he muſt have underſtood Madame d'Arblay as aſking him to give the company a ſpecimen of his *blindfold playing*. For that, he *did* ſometimes prepare himſelf by obſerving a careful regimen for ſeveral days; and the hour mentioned (Twiſs, *Cheſs*, vol. i. p. 168, and *Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. p. 109) for two of his exhibitions, and probably for all, was two o'clock. The dinner of the Club followed.

* Je ne perds point de vue ton voyage, avec ma fille, l'hiver prochain; et je ne doute aucunement, que tu ne regrettes, autant que moi, de n'avoir pas voulu me ſuivre. (*Letter*, March 20th, 1790.)

† Upon the whole, however, ſince both Philidor and Twiſs ſpeak of the ſubſcription as raiſed "for defraying Philidor's expenſes," it may be inferred, I think, that ſuch expenſes were reckoned, from the firſt, at ſome round ſum; and that it only remained for the individual members of the Club (who never remained the ſame for any length of

one time he ſpeaks of having already ſent home about ſeventeen hundred *livres* of it (nearly three hundred and twenty-five dollars;) at another, of fifteen *louis* (ſixty odd dollars) being ſtill due. It is more important to note, that Philidor appears always to have calculated on ſending every penny of this ſalary to his family, and on ſupporting himſelf by the other gains, which he had the opportunity of making.* Theſe muſt have been derived, *firſt*, from the ſtakes, for which Cheſs has always been played in England, and which, in his caſe, muſt have been treated as fees for inſtruction; and, *ſecondly*, from the admiſſion-tickets to his exhibitions of blindfold playing. As no one was known to poſſeſs that remarkable power before Philidor, and as no one aroſe in his day to ſhare the poſſeſſion with him, it was looked upon as a unique phenomenon; and the opportunity for obſerving it was eagerly ſought for by the ſcientific and the curious. Under theſe circumſtances, his friends of the Club made various arrangements, from time to time, to render the exhibitions of Philidor's blindfold playing a means of adding to his emolument. We are diſ-

time) to determine what ſhare of this ſum each would ſubſcribe. I ſuſpect that Gerber's *on dit* refers to Philidor's *ſalary*, and not to the profits of his concerts.

* "Mon plan eſt de vivre au dépens de mes petits profits, et de me donner les choſes, dont je pourrais avoir beſoin, et d'épargner entièrement ma ſouſcription." (*Letter*, Feb. 20th, 1788.)

tinctly informed, for example, by one of his letters, written in February, 1790, that at the Club-dinner, which followed the firſt exhibition of the ſeaſon, it was ſettled by vote, on motion of General Conway, that there ſhould be a dinner, preceded by a blind-fold match, every other Saturday. What might otherwiſe have appeared an undignified private ſpeculation, was made every way reſpectable by the direct patronage and countenance of the diſtinguiſhed gentlemen, who compoſed the aſſociation; the advertiſements were dated, and the games played, in their rooms; and the members appeared as privileged ſpectators. It is not probable, however, that preciſely ſuch exhibitions as theſe were given, or that they were put on ſuch a footing, until ſome years after Philidor's arrangement with his Engliſh friends in 1775. Diderot's friendly remonſtrance with him, in 1782, for perilling the talents and glory of a Pergoleſe in a *tour de force* more ſuited to a Greco, unleſs with the proſpect of great pecuniary advantage, implies that exhibitions of *three* games were then a novelty, and that no exhibitions had been hitherto paid for. Twiſs ſpeaks of his having played two public matches in 1783 and 1788, and four in 1789. It was not, therefore, as it would appear, until after the freſh enthuſiaſm, with which Philidor was at firſt welcomed, had paſſed away, and the overflowing ſtream of Engliſh bounty had

gradually ſhrunk to its natural channel, that his friends encouraged him to avail himſelf of the enduring intereſt in the diſplay of his unique powers, to make good the falling off in his earlier income. But the revenue from this ſource, too, muſt have gradually ſuffered ſome diminution, and then the exhibitions were made more frequent. If it be true, that when Diderot remonſtrated with him in 1782, Philidor's emolument from his blindfold playing amounted to ſcores or even hundreds of guineas a ſeaſon, then it ſpeaks loudly for his unexacting moderation of character, that in 1790—at a time when only fifty-ſix ſubſcribers encouraged the third edition of his *Analyſis*,* and when he was exerting himſelf beyond his ſtrength for his family†—he ſhould

* A ſubſcription-liſt ſo ſmall, compared with that of the ſecond edition, only proves that the Club had ceaſed to be a faſhionable aſſociation, organized for the accompliſhment of a certain object, and that it had now become a quiet Cheſs-Club, and nothing more. There were few members to ſubſcribe or to ſolicit ſubſcriptions, and no motive for making another extraordinary effort. So reduced had the members become, that when fourteen had aſſembled at the firſt dinner of the year 1790, Philidor informed his wife, that the ſeaſon would be a brilliant one. That the Club retained all their regard for Philidor undiminiſhed was teſtified that very year by the purchaſe of his portrait by Robineau for their rooms—"et me voilà (he writes to his wife) *pendu* dans notre ſalon d'échecs à Londres!"

† "J'apprends, avec grand plaiſir, que mes enfans pourront être placés; et réelment j'en ſerais bien enchanté, attendu que je ſurpaſſe mes forces dans ce moment."—(*Letter*, March 20, 1790.)

ſpeak to his wife of eight *louis** profit from his firſt exhibition as a moſt ſatisfactory reſult, without one word of complaint—without one backward glance at the golden ſhowers of a few years before. In fact, the profit and loſs account ſeems to have weighed leſs with him, than the pleaſure he took in the exerciſe of his rare gift, and in the expreſſions of delight and wonder, which it never failed to call forth.† The "enchantment" of the ſpectators was regularly echoed by the preſs, from the periſhable newſpaper ſheet up to the permanent record of the *Annual Regiſter* itſelf.‡

* Twiſs (*Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. p. 109) gives Philidor's laſt advertiſement, dated "Cheſs Club, 1795." The price of tickets was then five ſhillings. In 1790, it was probably the ſame, for forty-three tickets gave him the eight *louis* clear profit.

† "Il y a des éloges étonnants dans toutes les gazettes, au ſujet des trois parties ſans voir que j'ai jouées ſamedi dernier. Ils diſent, que la netteté de mes idées augmente avec mes années. Il eſt vrai, que jamais je n'ai eu la tête auſſi nette." (*Letter*, June 3, 1788.) "J'ai joué ſamedi dernier mes trois parties à la fois—tout le monde a été dans l'enchantement." (*Letter*, Feb. 1790.)

‡ Were not the *Palamède* a recogniſed Cheſs-claſſic, it would hardly be worth while to ſay anything more, than I have ſaid already, (*anth*, pp. 10, 11,) of its errors in reference to theſe blindfold exhibitions of Philidor. Perhaps *all* of them are ſufficiently refuted by the ſtatement, that they emanate from the brilliant poet and novelift, M. Méry, whoſe devotion to *hiſtorical* accuracy may be eſtimated by his off-hand way of diſpoſing of Philidor as an *émigré*, who died (*he rather thinks*) in 1795—("il eſt mort, je crois, en 1795.") *Some* of them, at all events, carry the character of pure and pleaſant fiction upon their very

Such were the occupations of Philidor, during his yearly viſits to the Britiſh capital.* The tenor

face. When, for example, M. Méry ſays, that Philidor uſed to give *Soirées* of [only] *one* or *two* blindfold games at a time, in London; that, by taxing the opulent Engliſhmen *a guinea* a head for admiſſion, he made money enough to compoſe operas at his leiſure, and to *give leſſons in Cheſs* to Jean-Jacques Rouſſeau; and that Jean-Jacques [in ſpite of ſuch inſtruction] was a weak player, but did not *confeſs* the fact in his *Confeſſions*—who does not ſee, that, as the laſt of theſe careleſs aſſertions was made for the joke's ſake, with full knowledge that it could be confuted on the ſpot by opening the book, ſo all the reſt are thrown out, with the moſt entire unconcern, whether the reader ſhall take them for abſolute *fabrications*, or merely for wild *exaggerations*? *One* of M. Méry's random ſhots does, indeed, borrow ſome appearance of approaching the mark, from Philidor's adopting a regimen before playing—namely, the ſtatement, that when Philidor, on juſt *three* occaſions in his life, [preciſe M.r Méry!] played *three* ſuch games at once, his faculties were ſo completely exhauſted, that he was unable, for a long time, to collect his thoughts again. M. Méry, however, appears to have had no other authority for ſaying this, than Diderot's letter. But Diderot betrays no knowledge of *Philidor's* having actually experienced any ſuch exhauſtion: he is merely attempting to frighten Philidor with the apprehenſion, that he *might* exhauſt his faculties, inaſmuch as *M. de Légal* had ſuffered the moſt alarming proſtration from playing only *one* game without the board. The truth is, M. Méry *really* drew his picture from poor La Bourdonnais—as appears clearly enough from a half-recantation in *La Régence* for 1851, (p. 131.) Philidor can have ſuffered no extraordinary fatigue, or it would have been phyſically impoſſible for him to give his blindfold *Soirées* once a fortnight, through the ſeaſon; nor would he have written, as he did, to his wife, in 1790, with the weight of ſixty-four years upon him: "Je t'aſſure, que cela ne me fatigue pas autant que bien des gens peuvent le croire."

* That Philidor really enjoyed living in England for ſomething be-

of his life at home, during the remaining two-thirds of each year, was undoubtedly influenced by his new arrangements, as well as by other cauſes, which were coming into operation at about the ſame time, but by no means in ſuch a manner, as to juſtify the very unfavourable—not to ſay very harſh—ſtatements of certain thoughtleſs French writers, who have haſtily applied to the whole of his later years the cenſure, which M. Fétis has too haſtily applied to the period from 1785 to his death. While M. Scudo, for example, has ſimply copied Fétis, with no diſtruſt of his accuracy, M. Adam—the pleaſant writer as well as charming compoſer—has repreſented Philidor as merely trifling with his profeſſion, and as giving to Muſic only ſo much time as he could ſpare from Cheſs.* But it is certain, that

---

ſides the money it brought him may be fairly enough inferred from the following anecdote in the later edition of Dibdin's *Bibliomania*, (1842, p. 612)—"William Templeman, of Hare Hatch, Berkſhire, was a great Cheſs-player. . . . . He ſaid, that he once ſat on Philidor's knee, who patted his cheek, and told him 'there was nothing like Cheſs and *Engliſh roaſt beef*.'" But he did *not* tell Mr. Templeman, what I dare ſay Twiſs had to extort from him, and then was mean enough to repeat—"Among the *Ladies* he has not met with a firſt or even ſecond-rate player." (*Cheſs*, vol. i. p. 165.) I call my fair readers to witneſs, that—ſo far from adopting this piece of malice into my text—I have degraded it to the foot of the page, and have condemned it to the inſignificance of *Brevier*.

* "Un ſeul compoſiteur, depuis Rameau, avait obtenu un ſuccès décidé à ce théâtre, [the *Opéra-Français*,] c'était PHILIDOR avec ſon

both M. Adam and M. Scudo, and he whom they have followed, M. Fétis, have ſpoken under very erroneous impreſſions of the real facts of the caſe.

From 1759 to 1775—from the compoſition of *Blaiſe le Savetier* to his engagement with the Engliſh Club—the ſeries of Philidor's muſical productions had been unbroken. It would not have been ſurpriſing, nor even particularly cenſurable, if now —after ſo many years of labour, and upon the approach of old age—he had been tempted, by the large ſums he had received from the ſubſcribers to his book, and by his regular annual ſalary, to conſider his profeſſion as ſubſtantially changed, and to have indulged himſelf in a reſpite from the exciting and exhauſting toil of muſical compoſition. And if, with ſuch a view of what was henceforth to be his ſpecial avocation and ſureſt reſource, he had ſpent more hours than before at the *Café de la Régence*,

Ernelinde; mais ce compoſiteur ſemblait ne prendre ſon art que comme un délaſſement; ce qui était ſérieux et important pour lui, c'étaient les échecs, et ce n'eſt que dans les moments perdus que lui laiſſait ſon jeu favori, et pour ſe repoſer des fatigues que lui cauſaient les combinaiſons de l'échiquier, qu'il conſentait à s' occuper de ſes opéras." (Adam, *Derniers Souvenirs d'un Muſicien*, p. 183.)—It is a pity that the lateſt and ableſt eulogiſt of Philidor, M. Arthur Pougin, ſhould have been equally miſled, with Adam and Scudo, by the authority of Fétis. M. Pougin's noble rehabilitation of his countryman, in the *Revue et Gazette Muſicale de Paris*, (for Sept. 11th and 25th, and Oct. 2d, 1859,) was made without any ſuſpicion, that a ſtranger had taken the initiative in the ſame good work.

to keep himſelf in full ſtrength as a Cheſs-player, who could reaſonably maintain, that he was not in the way of profeſſional duty? But Philidor did not ſo reaſon, nor did he ſo conduct himſelf. When he returned from his firſt ſeaſon in England, with hundreds of guineas in his pocket, his firſt thought appears to have been, that he could now achieve ſomething greater in muſic, than the neceſſity of providing for conſtantly-returning wants had permitted him to do before. One act operas, ſpeedily compoſed for a ſpeedy return of profit, no longer anſwered to his profeſſional aſpirations. Beſides, he was now no longer maſter of the field, which for twenty years had been almoſt excluſively his own. A new ſtar had riſen—not to diminiſh the luſtre of his—but to divide with it the admiring gaze of the public. The operas of Grétry were now an attractive novelty; and Philidor—although his pieces ſtill kept the ſtage and ſtill elicited the warmeſt applauſe—was not ſo preſſed by the Directors for new compoſitions, as he had been before, nor could he feel the ſame motive for haſtening a freſh appearance.* He deliberately turned his attention, there-

* [How rapidly the operas of Grétry were produced, and with what ſucceſs they were exhibited, at both the *Opéra-Français* and the *Comédie-Italienne*, appears from the *Mercure Français*. The Publiſher and Editor of this periodical, Lacombe, was the brother-in-law of Grétry: it was natural, therefore, that he ſhould be ready enough to extol the compoſitions of his relative, eſpecially when he had all Paris on his

fore, to another department of profeſſional labour. He took as his theme the *Carmen Seculare* of Horace. So far from being deterred by the difficulties of wedding a characteriſtic production of ancient Pagan Literature to an art, that bears almoſt excluſively the ſtamp of modern Chriſtian cultivation, he appears to have grappled with his taſk as one that would enable him to do juſtice to his genius and his ſcience. Upon this taſk he worked ſlowly—but, to all appearance, aſſiduouſly—for two or three years; yet not with ſuch entire abjuration of his dramatic career, but that he alſo compoſed an elaborate Lyric Tragedy, his *Perſée*, during the ſame period. The *Carmen Seculare* was firſt brought out at London, in the year 1779, and afterwards at Paris. The great ſucceſs, which it met with, attracted the attention of Catharine of Ruſſia: ſhe requeſted a copy of the ſcore, and rewarded the compoſer with imperial munificence.* The *Perſée* was brought out at the

---

ſide. The tone of decided reſpect and admiration, with which Lacombe everywhere ſpeaks of Philidor, may be taken as repreſenting the feeling of Grétry himſelf.]

* Gerber ſays "600 Liv." (Pounds ſterling, I hope, and not *Livres Tournois.*)—It was performed three nights (ſays Twiſs) at Freemaſon's Hall. In 1788, it was again brought out in London, at an entertainment given by the Knights of the Bath. (Burney, in Rees's *Cyclopædia.*) It was then publiſhed at Paris, "dedicated to the Empreſs, with an engraven title-page, repreſenting the arms of Ruſſia." (Twiſs.) It appears, moreover, from a letter of Philidor's, (June 3, 1778,) that it

Opéra-Français in 1780. Two other dramatic compoſitions, one of which muſt have been the ſubject of long and careful ſtudy, occupied the time of Philidor for the next four or five years:—the grand opera of *Thémiſtocle* was repreſented at Fontainebleau, in preſence of the Court, in October, 1785; and a few days later *L'Amitié au Village*, in one act, was brought out at the *Comédie-Italienne*. The tragic piece was remarkable for elegance of ſtyle and originality of inſtrumentation, but did not produce ſo much effect as its lighter companion, which excited ſo lively an enthuſiaſm, that the audience called for the compoſer—an honour at that time almoſt without precedent.*

---

was publiſhed by ſubſcription—the greater part of the ſubſcribers (I will venture to ſay) being Engliſh.—Catharine addreſſed her application and acknowledgments to Philidor through his friend Grimm. "Cette grande Princeſſe," he writes, "ne ſe borne pas à vouloir entendre votre ouvrage en concert; elle a fait écrire à un des plus célèbres ſavants d'Italie, pour lui demander un programme, afin de relever le charme de votre muſique par la pompe du ſpectacle et la repréſentation exacte des cérémonies réligieuſes, qui vous ont inſpiré." The heir-preſumptive of Frederic the Great acknowledged the receipt of the *Carmen Seculare* in MS. by a letter, (Feb. 10, 1783,) in which he ſtyles himſelf one of his greateſt admirers, and by the gift of a gold ſnuff-box ſet with diamonds. When he had become King, he was equally gracious and friendly in returning his thanks for the engraved ſcore. (*Palamède*, t. vii. pp. 179—181.)

* Fétis.—[It appears, however, that Philidor had received the ſame honour twenty-one years before. "À la première repréſentation du *Sorcier*, le parterre, tranſporté d' admiration, demanda les auteurs, ce

This detail of the profeſſional labour performed by Philidor, from 1775 to 1785, while a third of each year was ſpent with the London Cheſs-Club, preſents the picture of a muſician, ſtill devoted to his art, who may have yielded ſomething to the demands of advancing years and of threatening infirmity—ſomething, perhaps, to the capricious exactions of a poetic conſtitution—when enabled to do ſo by the increaſe of his income from another ſource, but who never ceaſed to do full juſtice to his profeſſion, his family, or himſelf.* No loſs of re-

---

qui n'était pas encore arrivé à la *Comédie-Italienne*. Philidor eut cela de commun avec Voltaire, qui, le premier, avait reçu cet hommage au *Théâtre-Français*, à l'occaſion de *Mérope*." (Caſtil-Blaze, *De l'Opéra*, t. i. p. 17.)]

* Philidor in his laſt years ſuffered from gout. From a paltry anecdote of Grimm's—whoſe malicious goſſip ſpared nobody—I ſhould infer, that before 1785 Philidor's conſtitution had begun to be ſhaken. (*Correſpondance*, t. iii. p. 362.)—That Philidor could no more obey Dr. Johnſon's preſcription to "work doggedly," without regard to mood or condition, than others, who produce by genial inſpiration and not by talent alone—(juſt as Milton could compoſe only in winter, and Goethe could reduce to writing only what he had never ſpoken of to another)—appears from an early letter of his to Favart, written at a period (1763) when his ſucceſs ſhould have put him in the beſt of ſpirits.—"Monſieur, Depuis quinze jours, que j'ai votre poëme entre les mains, j'ai voulu eſſayer pluſieurs fois y travailler, mais j'ai trop d'humeur et de chagrin pour avoir la tête tranquille. En conſéquence, il ne m'eſt pas poſſible de me charger d'aucun ouvrage de théâtre. . . . . Je ne puis m'accoutumer à une ſuite conſtante de découragement."

putation or of popularity had given him cauſe to abandon his art in diſguſt. And yet, M. Fétis aſſures us, that *Thémiſtocle* was Philidor's laſt opera; that after the compoſition of this piece, he ceaſed to work for the ſtage; and that he gave himſelf up, without reſerve or reſtraint, to his paſſion for Cheſs —ſpending the greater part of every day at the *Café de la Régence*. Were the facts really as ſtated by M. Fétis, they would by no means juſtify the harſh inference, which he muſt have expected his readers to draw from them. In his ignorance of Philidor's engagement with the London Club, he ſuppoſes him to have ſpent the whole of every year from 1779 to 1795 at Paris; and when he ſays, that Philidor abandoned muſic and ſpent his time in playing Cheſs, he means to charge him with leaving his family to comparative deſtitution for the ſake of a piece of ſelf-indulgence, which under ſuch circumſtances would be abſolutely criminal. Philidor *might* have played Cheſs all day at *La Régence* without ſo entirely betraying the intereſts of his family. His ſalary from the London Club, his penſion from the King, and his perquiſites as a compoſer of operas always on the ſtage, would have furniſhed them with reſources—if not abundant—yet adequate perhaps to their neceſſities. M. Fétis, however, is ſomewhat miſtaken, even in his facts: Philidor did *not* ceaſe, in 1785, to labour as a muſi-

cian, nor even to write for the ſtage. We have Philidor's own authority, in Twiſs's anecdotes, that in 1787 he compoſed *La belle Eſclave*, and in 1789 *Le Mari comme il les faudrait tous.** By his correſpondence it appears, that in 1789 he alſo produced a very elaborate compoſition for ſome celebration of the recovery of George III. from his firſt attack of inſanity; and that in 1790 he was preparing to bring out, in London, a *Te Deum*.† It is by no means likely, that we have an abſolutely complete account of *all* Philidor did as a compoſer, eſpecially during the later period of his life, when he was leſs prominently before the public, than he had been in his youth; but we have fortunately enough to vin-

---

* M. Fétis himſelf mentions *La belle Eſclave* among the works of Philidor, but he avows himſelf unable to give the date.

† It appears from Philidor's letters, that the compoſition in queſtion was an Ode in Engliſh, ſet to muſic at the requeſt of Gallini, Director of the London Opera-houſe. The lively profeſſional ſpirit, with which he expreſſed himſelf to his wife, while working at this taſk in old age, was worthy of his beſt years: "J'avance dans mon ouvrage, et je ſuis très content de mes idées. Je n'ai rien négligé, et j'oſe dire, que j'ai fait l'impoſſible pour me mettre en peu de temps au fait de la proſodie et de l'accent de la langue anglaiſe. J'eſpère réuſſir, et je compte que je reviendrai avec tous mes brouillons de la totalité de mon ouvrage. *J'ai la plus grande envie de prouver que la vieilleſſe ne m'a pas encore éteint le génie.*"—[I now think it probable, that the *Te Deum* may have been an old compoſition—the ſame which is mentioned in the *Mercure Français* for June, 1773, (p. 145,) as having been performed at the *Concert Spirituel* of that ſeaſon.]

dicate him from the charge of even a venial dereliction of his duty. If the written record of his works had really ended abruptly—as it does with Fétis—in 1785, we ſhould ſtill feel the moſt entire aſſurance, that more had ſtill been done—even until the laſt days of his life—by a muſician, who, like Gluck, had grown higher in his profeſſional aſpirations as he had advanced in years, and whoſe ſelf-ſacrificing devotion to his family—the trait of character, which is eſpecially treaſured up in ſacred remembrance by his deſcendants—muſt have always ſupplied him with motives for continually exerting his powers as a compoſer.*

* The ſuppoſition is, beſides, all but abſurd, that ſuch a father of a family—or even any man of ſound mind, *without* a family—ſhould play Cheſs *temperately* up to the age of fifty-five, and then ſuddenly become a Cheſs-*maniac*, deaf to all conſiderations of duty and propriety.

CHAPTER VI.

FRENCH REVOLUTION—PHILIDOR'S LAST VISIT TO ENGLAND—DEATH AND CHARACTER.

MEANWHILE the whirlpool of the Revolution was beginning to ſet in motion thoſe fatal circles, which were deſtined to involve, with the reſt, the feelings and intereſts of the harmleſs Cheſs-player, now compaſſed about with years and infirmity. It is no diſcredit to Philidor, that he was, as his deſcendant has called him, "a man of *Eighty-Nine*"*—that he ſympathized warmly with the movement for the abolition of the old privileges and abuſes, and

* It was "an hard ſaying" of the great New-England Judge, "*Th'oph Parſons*," (ſo called,) in reference to the men of his own time and place, who ſympathized with the firſt promiſes of the French Revolution—"The man, who is *not* a Democrat at twenty, is a *knave*; the man, who *is* a Democrat at forty, is a *fool*."—Artiſts and Poets are always under twenty. Philidor found himſelf in company with, not only artiſts and poets, philoſophers and *ſavants*, but alſo with the beſt of the clergy, the untitled rural *curés*.

for the ſubſtitution of a limited monarchy in place of a deſpotiſm, which had now become even more contemptible than onerous. His ſentiments are freely expreſſed in the laſt letters of his we have—thoſe of 1790. By that time the Revolution, which had hitherto preſented nothing but "a pleaſant exerciſe of hope and joy" to minds like his, had, as he ſuppoſed, fairly completed its courſe—France was in poſſeſſion of a good king as the head and centre of free inſtitutions, and Philidor aſked and wiſhed for nothing more. He predicts in February, that before the month of July his country would have ſecured the admiring reſpect of the univerſe—lawſuits would be few or none, taxes would be reduced at leaſt a third, and yet the intereſt of the public debt would be honeſtly paid. Nay, the very character of the nation would henceforth be changed; the education of the young would be quite other than it had been; people—*French* people—would meet to converſe gravely and on grave ſubjects, and no longer waſte time in frivolity and nonſenſe. He regrets, that, while he himſelf feels nothing but unutterable joy and patriotic pride, his firſt-born, our André, ſhould not more fully ſympathize with him; he is delighted, however, that his ſons have been enrolled in the National Guard, and hopes that "his young ſoldiers" will do their duty. He alludes to Lafayette in terms to ſatisfy even a grateful

American, and ſuggeſts the propriety of raiſing an altar to the Biſhop of Autun, better known as the ſaintly Charles Maurice Talleyrand. In ſhort, theſe perfectly honeſt and homely utterances of Philidor to his wife, more than any high-wrought literary effort, make real to us the inconceivable faſcination exerted upon the beſt men—men "who were ſtrong in love"—by this firſt apparition of "Her that roſe upon the banks of Seine," before the civic wreath, wherewith ſhe bound her temples, had betrayed "the breathings of her dragon creſt."*

Philidor was ſlow to believe that the character of ferocity, which the movement ſoon began to

* O pleaſant exerciſe of hope and joy!
For mighty the Auxiliars, which then ſtood
Upon our ſide, we who were ſtrong in love.
WORDSWORTH—*French Revolution.*

Who riſes on the banks of Seine,
And binds her temples with the civic wreath?
What joy to read the promiſe of her mien!
How ſweet to reſt her wide-ſpread wings beneath!
* * * *
But ſhe through many a change of form hath gone,
And ſtands amidſt you now an armed creature,
Whoſe panoply is not a thing put on,
But the live ſcales of a portentous nature;
That, having wrought its way from birth to birth,
Stalks round—abhorred by Heaven, a terror to the Earth!
I marked the breathings of her dragon creſt—
WORDSWORTH—*Ode.*

exhibit, was anything more than accidental and tranſient. He had had ſome experience of popular excitements in England—Lord George Gordon's Mob had filled London with much braying and ſome burning during one of his London ſeaſons—and he looked for nothing worſe from the wolfiſh gang of Marat: he was prepared for the demolition of a priſon and a palace or two, but not for the cry of "*A la lanterne!*"—"*Parbleu, ma chère!* (he would ſay to his wife) they really mean to ſet Paris on fire by the four corners—give me my cane, and let me go and ſee." But it is evident, that Philidor ſaw and heard, at laſt, a good deal more than he liked. For towards the cloſe of the year 1792—that is, after the blood of the September maſſacres had tainted the air of France—without waiting, as had been his wont to do, for the month of February to come, he made his way to England. He obtained a paſſport from the ruling authority of the time; and there is impreſſive evidence, that he never ranked himſelf with the enemies even of the revolutionary government of his country; but I have no doubt it was a wholeſome fear of *another* "celebrated" *La Régence* player, and not the declaration of war by England after the execution of Louis, that prevented any attempt to return home during the years 1793 and 1794:—Maximilian Robeſpierre might have ſeen in him, not the harmleſs Cheſs-

player, but the penſioner of two Kings and the favourite of a fugitive pretender to the crown.* At all events, it muſt have been a matter of congratulation to his family, that during the Reign of Terror Philidor was not merely in ſafety, but alſo in the midſt of the friends of twenty years. In all other reſpects, indeed, his ſituation was neceſſarily ſuch as to prey conſtantly upon his ſpirits, and to weaken ſtill more his enfeebled health.† He bore up under his afflictions, however, as he might, and frequented the Club as in happier days. He ſtill proved at the board, that neither age nor diſeaſe had taken aught

* I think André Philidor good authority for his father's going to England before his uſual time, and for his having obtained a paſſport —but not from the *Committee of Public Safety*, for that body, as known to hiſtory, was not conſtituted until April 6th, 1793. The inference from his going earlier than uſual is not only fair and natural, but is alſo ſupported by current tradition, as given in Fétis and the *Palamède*. André makes the war the cauſe of his father's not attempting to return; but Philidor had gone to and fro, without let or hinderance, during three previous wars.—The *Palamède* and Mr. Walker preſerve the tradition, that Robeſpierre was a Cheſs-player and a regular frequenter of the *Café de la Régence*.—Monsieur (afterwards Louis XVIII.) was a member of the Paris Cheſs-Club, and a ſubſcriber to the *Analyſe* of 1777. I have ſomewhere read, that he was alſo, on one occaſion, an adverſary of Philidor's in a blindfold match, and that he tried in vain to diſconcert him by making a falſe move.

† He had accounted even his annual voluntary ſeparation from his family an exile—"Enfin, voilà dejà un mois paſſé de mon *exil*; je voudrais être au bout de mes engagements, pour vivre avec toi." (*Letter*, Feb. 20th, 1788.)

from the ſtrength of his play, and he ſtill ventured, without danger, upon what Diderot had called the "perilous eſſay" of his blindfold matches. So late as February and March, 1794, when ſixty-eight years old, the Turkiſh ambaſſador ſaw him, with admiration, conduct, the firſt time two, the ſecond three, games at once—with the ſlight relief, which he ſometimes allowed himſelf in later years, of having one of the three boards under his own eye.*

At length the Reign of Terror had paſſed away—the laſt *fournée* of Fouquier-Tinville had fed the

* The preſence of the Turkiſh ambaſſador, at theſe matches, appears to have emboldened his Interpreter—ſome lying Greek, I preſume—to circulate the ſtory, *after Philidor's death*, that, immediately ſubſequent to his laſt exhibition, in 1795, the Turk had invited him to his houſe, and, after having beaten him in ſix conſecutive games, informed him, that there were ſeveral players in Conſtantinople, from whom he himſelf had to accept the Rook. I have no doubt of the falſehood; yet the ſtory *might* be true, without damage to Philidor's reputation:—the pieces were ſtrange and not eaſily diſtinguiſhable; and the game itſelf was not the European game of Cheſs—inaſmuch, *e.g.*, as the *Queen* had the move of the *Knight*. (Twiſs's *Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. pp. 112–14.) Mr. Walker, while juſtly exploding this ſilly ſtory, is a little unjuſt to Twiſs; but Silberſchmidt (*Lehrbuch*, p. 301) is perfectly glorious in his attempt to *outgreek* the genuine ſon of "*Græcia mendax*."—It was in like manner reported, (Twiſs, *Cheſs*, vol. i. p. 188,) that Philidor had been beaten by Kempelen's Automaton, in 1783—another falſehood, which was ſtill quite true; for Philidor, to favour the good baron's intereſts, played *alla Ganapierde*—he tried to get beaten and could not. He told André, who was with him at the time, that he had never played ſo fatiguing a game.

guillotine; and, by the opening of the year 1795, there was good proſpect of a ſtate of things, in which a quiet old man might reaſonably hope for a natural death. To return to Paris, to breathe his laſt in the boſom of his family, was the one object, on which all the aſpirations and all the efforts of Philidor were now concentred. But when his friends at home made application, at the proper office of the new government, for the neceſſary ſafe-conduct, they found that Philidor was regarded as an *émigré* —a claſs held in peculiar abhorrence for their avowed ſympathy, or perſonal co-operation, with the enemies and invaders of France. It was neceſſary to collect teſtimony, and to multiply applications to various Committees, in order to remove, if poſſible, the obſtacle created by this fatal ſuſpicion. Philidor, in the meanwhile, aware, it appears, of nothing but that his application was going through ſome not unuſual proceſs of official routine, ſtill kept up heart and hope, and actually gave exhibitions at the Club in February and May. At length, however, either becauſe he felt himſelf ſinking, or more probably becauſe he was in immediate expectation of receiving his paſſport, he announced by advertiſement, that "by particular deſire, and poſitively for the very laſt time, he would play, on Saturday, the 20th of June, at two o'clock preciſely, three games at once againſt three good Cheſs-players, two of them

without ſeeing either board, and the third on looking over the table." Mr. Atwood, the celebrated mathematician, was one of thoſe players, and recorded the game in which he took part. The preſence of Philidor is traced at the Club for a few days longer. On the 29th of June he played two games with Mr. Atwood at the odds of the Pawn and Two Moves, of which he loſt one. Both of theſe games—with a reverent regard, no doubt, for the laſt efforts of the great maſter—were recorded by Mr. Atwood, and were printed from his manuſcripts by Mr. Walker in 1835 for the firſt time. Philidor never viſited the Club again. He was now made aware, that his paſſport had been refuſed, and that he was on the liſt of "ſuſpected characters," or "perſons who had been denounced by a Committee of French Informers." This ſudden extinction of his one cheriſhed hope, under circumſtances to ſhut out, for him, all proſpect of any change for the better, proved to be more than he could bear. "From this moment (in the words of the Obituary) he became the martyr of grief—his philoſophy forſook him—his tears were inceſſant—and he ſunk into the grave." He died on Monday, the 24th of Auguſt, 1795.* The ſame affectionate notice gives

* It was a diſtreſſing circumſtance, connected with Philidor's death, that the information, which reduced him to deſpair and made him an unreſiſting victim to his habitual infirmity, (the gout,) proved to be in

us the information, that "for the laſt two months, Philidor had been kept alive merely by art, and the kind attentions of an old and worthy friend. To the laſt moment of his exiſtence, he enjoyed, though near ſeventy years of age, a ſtrong retentive memory,

ſo far unfounded, that his family finally ſucceeded in procuring the ſafe-conduct for him, juſt in time to learn, that it had come too late.—It is ſingular, that ſo many dates ſhould have been aſſigned to the death of Philidor. The *European Magazine*, *e.g.*, gives the 28th of Auguſt; La Bourdonnais, (in his *Palamède* biography,) the 29th; Fétis, (after Choron and Fayolle, I ſuppoſe,) the 30th; and the *Gentleman's Magazine*—nay, André Philidor himſelf—the 31ſt. Several of theſe authorities kindly allow Philidor a day or two for reading his own Obituary before taking his departure. La Bourdonnais ſhould have been correct, for he had Walker's *Biographical Sketch* before his eyes; but, unhappily, his author had introduced the Obituary by ſaying: "On Saturday, Auguſt 29th, the *public were informed* of the death of this unrivalled Cheſs-player"—and the lazy tranſlator, conceiving he had got his date already, ſpared himſelf the trouble of reading any farther. The notice in the *European Magazine* contains only three or four lines; it is ten years out in Philidor's age; and is evidently, therefore, the work of one who *knew* as little as he *cared* about the matter. The only real authority—and it is perfectly ſatisfactory—is the Obituary, which appeared in the London newſpapers, on Saturday, Auguſt 29th. None of thoſe papers are within my reach; but Twiſs, whom I follow, (*Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. p. 110,) furniſhes good proof, that he had the original newſpaper document before his eyes, and that he copied it accurately, viz., he gives the day of the *week*, as well as the day of the *month*, of *both dates*—that of Philidor's death, and that of the newſpaper, which contained the Obituary. One French author, the Comte de Baſterot, (in his very intereſting *Traité élémentaire*, p. 48,) and the always accurate German *Schachzeitung*, (vol. ii. p. 36,) give the true date.

which long rendered him remarkable in the circle of his acquaintances; and he was a man of thoſe meek qualities, that rendered him not leſs eſteemed as a companion, than admired for his extraordinary ſkill."*

The tribute thus paid to the memory of Philidor was evidently the expreſſion of ſincere reſpect and regret. The Club, of which he had been for more than twenty years a member, ſuſpended their meetings for ſome time after his death, "as a mark of reſpect to the immortal name of Philidor." So we are informed by Mr. Walker.† I wiſh he had not added, that "it was diſgraceful to them, that no funeral tablet was erected, to point out the place of his reſt." I wiſh he had not charged "the great, the noble, the wealthy" patrons of Philidor with ſuffering him to die, "almoſt literally in a garret, deprived of thoſe comforts, which ſoothe down the aſperities of utter deſtitution."‡ Mr. Walker is,

* In this paragraph I have compared and reconciled, as well as I could, André Philidor's ſtatement and the Obituary in Twiſs's *Miſcellanies*, vol. ii. pp. 110–12. From the letters of Mme George Sand's father, in her *Mémoires*, it appears that André had ſome influence with the revolutionary authorities, even during the Reign of Terror. It is Twiſs (*ut ſuprà*) that gives Philidor's laſt advertiſement.—Mr. Atwood's MS. notes were publiſhed in Mr. Walker's "*Selection of Games actually played by Philidor:*" London, 1835.

† "*Selection of Games*," p. 61.

‡ "*Cheſs without the board*," in Walker's *Cheſs and Cheſs-players*, p. 127. (From *Fraſer's Magazine* for March, 1840.)

indeed, entitled—by his uniform zeal for the glory of Philidor, and by his own noble conduct in the case of La Bourdonnais*—to visit with indignant censure any real neglect of the dying master by the English Club; but I am bound to say, in justice to an honourable association of gentlemen, that I believe the charge of such neglect to be entirely unfounded. The charge is made by Mr. Walker alone, and is based solely (so far as appears) upon oral tradition† collected by himself. The facts so ascertained amount to precisely three more than *he*

* La Bourdonnais came to London, in the last stages of a dropsy, late in November, 1840. It was presently ascertained, that he was on the point of being ejected from the garret, to which he had been compelled to retreat. A Committee of English Chess-players, of whom Mr. Walker was one, subscribed a hundred pounds, within half an hour, for the relief of the suffering stranger. They removed him to comfortable lodgings; procured medical assistance; and bestowed every kind of attention upon him until his death. They attended the funeral in a body, and placed over his grave a stone, with the inscription—LOUIS-CHARLES DE LA BOURDONNAIS, *the celebrated Chess-player, died December 13th, 1840, aged 43.* Nor did they pause in their noble work, until they had raised a large sum for Madame La Bourdonnais herself. It is a pleasure to renew the record of such acts as these.

† How uncertain any Chess-*tradition* is may be inferred from that of the *Café de la Régence*, on which M. Fétis relied, and by which he was misled. I must add, that the English tradition, on which Mr. Walker relies, is still more suspicious, because it betrays a partisan *animus*. It probably came to him through some Chess-player, whose social position or political opinions led him either to invent facts, or to interpret harmless real facts, to the injury of a Club composed, to a great extent, of "the great, the noble, and the wealthy."

had learned, as well as we, from the newſpaper Obituary; and it is curious to obſerve, how completely this enthuſiaſtic writer has magnified the real weight of theſe facts—for ſuch readers, eſpecially, as have never learned to make allowance for the *furor irlandeſe**—by the redundant vehemence of the figurative language, in which he envelopes them. They *appear* to prove, that the gentlemen of the Club left Philidor to die in a garret; that the "old and worthy friend," who ſaved him from dying abſolutely alone, "ſupported" him, with no aſſiſtance from them; and that they took no thought for his funeral, any more than for his monument. M. St. Amant, accordingly, clothing the impreſſion he had thus received in a veſture as flowery as his author's, holds up to his countrymen the wretched picture of Philidor's "pauper-like condition," and of his "death in a garret."† But Mr. Walker *really* ſays

* When the Italians adopted the term *furor franceſe* to denote a model madneſs, they probably had not extended their obſervations beyond the continent.

† That is, Mr. Walker ſpeaks of "the aſperities of utter deſtitution" in ſuch exciting terms, that M. St. Amant underſtands this quite unappropriated "utter deſtitution" to be the "état voiſin de la pauvreté" of Philidor in particular; and, the pathos of the "*almoſt* literally in a garret" being entirely too overwhelming to permit the tender-hearted Frenchman to recogniſe the exiſtence of the trifling limitary particle, he ſpeaks of the Engliſh Committee, in the caſe of La Bourdonnais, as "recollecting [*quite* literally] the garret of Philidor." (*Palamède-St. Amant*, t. i. pp. 16, 17.)

only that Philidor "died *almoſt* literally in a garret" —which, being interpreted, clearly means, that Philidor did *not* die in a garret at all.* Of the remaining two traditionary facts, Mr. Walker appears not to have reflected, that the one completely neutralizes the other:—the fact, that the members of the Club took immediate cognizance of the death of their beloved maſter, by a very unuſual act of official mourning, makes it utterly prepoſterous to infer from the fact of their failing to erect a tablet to his memory, that they had taken no thought of his ſufferings or his wants on his death-bed. The aſſertion, that the dying old man was "chiefly indebted for *ſupport* to the aſſiduities of one kind friend," is a very careleſs deviation from the lan-

* It is not pretended, that Philidor—after having occupied better lodgings until his ſickneſs—was then obliged (and was ſuffered by his Engliſh friends) to retire to his "almoſt a garret," and that there was therefore the ſame reaſon for removing him, as exiſted in the caſe of poor La Bourdonnais. For all that appears, he died in the ſame modeſt quarters, which he had choſen to live in during his laſt reſidence in London. If they were leſs expenſive, than he had been wont to occupy, it was undoubtedly becauſe the anxious circumſtances, under which he was now living there, made every kind of economy both neceſſary and becoming. He was to meet the expenſe, not of a four months', but of an indefinitely long, reſidence in a foreign city. His penſion was gone—probably his theatrical perquiſites, beſides. His family would need anything he could poſſibly economize from his London ſalary and other earnings. Self-denial and economy of this kind might be carried far, without involving any ſuch diſtreſs, as would attract or require the attention of his friends.

guage of the Obituary:—Philidor was "*kept alive* for the laſt two months merely by *art*, and by the *kind attentions* of an old and worthy friend;" but there is nothing whatever in *theſe* words to juſtify what appears to be Mr. Walker's conſtruction, that the kind friend *ſupported the expenſe* of what was done for Philidor, "to keep him alive," either by medical art or otherwiſe.

If, therefore, the charges of Mr. Walker againſt the Engliſh Club are far from being ſuſtained even by the traditionary facts, which he himſelf adduces, ſtill leſs able are they to ſtand their ground againſt the ſtrong preſumptive evidence, that can be brought in conflict with them. For twenty years, the gentlemen of the Club had ſhown the moſt delicate and ſyſtematic attention to the pecuniary intereſts and perſonal comforts of Philidor. While their number had been decreaſing, they had kept up his ſalary. They had anticipated his wants by advancing their ſubſcriptions.* They had arranged and

* We know, (*Letter*, February, 1790,) that on one occaſion, certainly—and probably often or always—Count Brühl and General Conway paid Philidor their quota (a large proportion, too) of his ſalary, immediately on his arrival in England, and long before the ſubſcription was opened in the Club.—[The Rev. Mr. Pruen's *Introduction to the Hiſtory and Study of Cheſs* (p. 30) confirms what I have already ſaid, (*antè*, p. 78,) that Philidor had the opportunity (evidently with the ſanction and encouragement of the Club) to earn a good deal by playing as an inſtructor. His ſtake (underſtood to be a tuition-fee) was a crown a game.]

patroniſed frequent blindfold exhibitions in order to increaſe his income. Count Brühl had reduced his London expenſes a full half, by making him a daily gueſt at his table—a ſtep, which he would not have reſorted to, if his feeling towards him had not come to be that of ſincere perſonal friendſhip. Such appears to have been the habitual conduct of the members of the Club towards Philidor up to the laſt day of his preſence among them; and we have ſeen how entirely conſiſtent with ſuch conduct was their official action immediately after his death. Is it, then, within the bounds of poſſible belief, that for ſolely and preciſely the two months, which elapſed between theſe two dates, theſe ſame kind, conſiderate, and attentive friends ſhould have become unkind, inconſiderate, and inattentive to the ſame old man, under circumſtances to make the withholding of any poſſible kindneſs, conſiderateneſs, and attention mere barbarity?*

* Another conſideration, which has great weight with me, I do not introduce into the text, becauſe it is merely negative—viz., the papers of André Philidor do not betray the ſlighteſt knowledge of any ſuch neglect of his father. Yet, as the family immediately received ſuch details of Philidor's laſt illneſs, as could not have been learned from the Obituary, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the communication came from one, who muſt alſo have known—if the fact were really ſo—that "one old friend" had been compelled to bear every expenſe, and perform every kind office, required by the occaſion, becauſe thoſe, who had ſo long profeſſed to be the friends of the great Cheſs-player,

For my own part, I believe nothing of the kind. I do not entertain the ſlighteſt doubt, that the "old and worthy friend" was in communication with the gentlemen of the Club, and that he was enabled to perform his pious office, even to the laſt rites of ſepulture, by means, which they ſupplied. If the Obituary paſſes over what *they* did, to record the perſonal devotion of that one old friend, it is probably becauſe the Obituary itſelf was prepared by one of their own number. It is true, his former aſſociates ſet up no tablet to his memory*—an omiſ-

---

had barbarouſly deſerted him. If the informant were cognizant of ſuch a fact, he could hardly have forborne to diſcloſe it, ſo far, at leaſt, as was neceſſary, in order to do full juſtice to the "old friend;" the impreſſion thus left in the family could not have been forgotten, nor would it have been ſuppreſſed by the ſon in preparing a biography of his father.—The ſilence of Twiſs is alſo of ſome weight. He had had little to do with Philidor, it is true, after 1787; but if he was fond enough of malicious goſſip to record the victories of the Turkiſh ambaſſador, he could hardly have failed to know or preſerve ſo bad a trait of character as the unfeeling conduct of the Engliſh Club.

* That is to ſay, I *accept* it as true, on Mr. Walker's mere word, rather than to be always diſputing him, or impertinently calling upon him to prove a negative. But what if Mr. Walker himſelf has thought better of his denying the exiſtence of a monument? He did, indeed, make that denial, in 1835, in ſo many words; but, in 1840, he merely ſays, "Philidor paſſed from life in ſuch obſcurity, that I have never yet been able to diſcover the ſpot where he was buried." (*Cheſs and Cheſs-players*, p. 127.) If this poſition be really a ſubſtitute for the earlier one, the denial of the monument is, of courſe, given up; for Mr. Walker's inability to find the cemetery, in which Philidor was

ſion not regretted by one alone of Philidor's biographers; but the inference, that thoſe, who failed to do all they might have done *after* his death, had failed to do anything for him while dying, is warranted neither by ſound reaſon nor by actual experience:—it has often happened, that where a ſincere feeling of regret, and even of gratitude, has prompted the tribute of an act of piety like this, the execution of the purpoſe falls through from cauſes, that cannot fairly be ſaid to involve either reproach or diſgrace.

The connection of Philidor with the Engliſh Club is without a parallel in the hiſtory of Cheſs: it exhibits a picture of Cheſs-talent and of perſonal merit ſo perfectly appreciated and ſo honourably rewarded, as to reflect equal credit upon the noble patrons and upon the ſubject of their patronage. For the honour of human nature, ſuch a picture ſhould not wantonly be marred or defaced. I have not, therefore, thought it at all out of place to ſubject to the ſevereſt teſt of critical examination the traditionary charge, which would make the life

---

buried, would as well prove that he had no grave, as that his grave had no ſtone, and that he did not die at all, as that he died in obſcurity. We do not uſually conceive of that departure as an obſcure one, which is immediately followed by the protracted adjournment of a ſociety of diſtinguiſhed men, and to the announcement of which half a column is devoted in the leading weekly newſpapers.

of Philidor to have cloſed under circumſtances to embitter tenfold the chalice, which he was doomed to drink in ſolitude and in exile, to the endleſs diſgrace of men, for whom otherwiſe we could entertain no other ſentiments, than thoſe of peculiar reſpect and gratitude. I wiſh I might hope, that every reader is as fully ſatisfied as I am, that the charge is a calumny.*

It may ſeem quite unneceſſary, after preſenting ſo much of biographical detail, that ſpeaks for itſelf, to keep the hand ſtill upon the tablet, in an attempt to delineate the character of Philidor. Where, however, the biographer has been labouring to reſtore to all its rights a name, to which ſome injuſtice has been done, he may be indulged, by the good-natured reader, in a few words more, than what is merely enough. Philidor has too long been an object of living intereſt to the Cheſs-player alone, and to him ſolely as a Cheſs-player. But to me no part of my theme has been more attractive, than that which invited me to ſearch carefully into all the evidences of what my hero aſpired to do, and what he accom-

* In a letter received after the preceding ſheet had been printed, Mr. Lewis (the eminent Engliſh Cheſs-author and player) kindly anſwered ſome inquiries of mine, by ſaying: "Who 'the old and worthy friend' was, I know not. I always underſtood from Sarratt, that a Mr. Crawford, a very rich man, patroniſed Philidor, taking a leſſon—or being *ſuppoſed* to take a leſſon—daily, and giving him *carte blanche* to dinner, whenever it ſuited him."

pliſhed, as a Muſician. It has been matter of ſerious gratification to me to be able to ſhow, that the moſt celebrated of all Cheſs-players treated the game as a game, and not as a profeſſion; and that he reſerved all the activity of the beſt years of his life for his noble Art. For this Philidor would deſerve our reſpect, even if his honourable induſtry had procured him nothing more than his daily bread—if it had produced no works of more than temporary intereſt—if it had won him no place among thoſe, whoſe names the world "does not willingly let die." But ſuch was not the caſe. The name of Philidor muſt live, in the Hiſtory of Muſic, even if all his works muſt periſh. All the authors of French muſical hiſtory, from La Borde, through Caſtil-Blaze and Fétis, down to Poiſot, unite in declaring, that Philidor ſuſtained the leading part in the work of founding the moſt thoroughly national of all his country's muſical entertainments, the *Opéra-Comique*.* Nor can the reform of the ſerious opera ever be mentioned, without doing Philidor the juſtice of having been the firſt and only compoſer, that achieved a ſucceſs, which

* Fétis ſays, (*Curioſités*, p. 358,) in reference to Philidor's coöperation with Monſigny in creating the *Opéra-Comique*, "L'autre (Philidor) poſſédait plus de ſcience muſicale que tous ſes compatriotes."—Caſtil-Blaze, (*De l'Opéra*, t. i. p. 33,)—after ſpeaking of the earlier French compoſers—adds, "Si l'on excepte PHILIDOR et M. Goſſec, aucun n'avait cette ſcience profonde, ce ſtyle grandioſe, qui commandent l'admiration dans tous les pays."

could be perfected and made durable by no gentler agencies than the energetic genius, the iron will, and the terrific *bâton* of Gluck.

No composer creates or reforms a department of the Lyric Drama by dint of mere talent and musical science. Without, therefore, claiming for Philidor an equality with the five or six Immortals of the art, it is safe to assert, that he possessed Genius, and that too of a high order. We cannot, to be sure, appeal for the proof to the living utterances of the concert-room or the stage. But we can produce witnesses, whose competency cannot be called in question. Grétry, his contemporary, puts Philidor side by side even with Gluck himself, for "force of harmonic expression."* Fétis, at the same time the Nestor and the Corypheus of living musical critics, awards to the works of Philidor a peculiar stamp of originality. And both of these high authorities ascribe to him a characteristic mark of genius,—the disposition and the capacity to invent new means of expression. One instances his new orchestral effects; the other, original combinations of rhythm.†

* *Mémoires*, (1829,) t. i. p. 157. "Si les musiciens de nos jours étaient jugés par l'esprit qui caractérisait les anciens, l'on nommerait Gluck et Philidor, pour la force de l'expression harmonique."

† *Ante*, p. 47, and the foot-notes pp. 65–67. I add here the words of some additional authorities. Fétis says of *Thémistocle*, much as he had said of *Ernelinde*, "Cet ouvrage est remarquable . . . par *la nouveauté des formes de l'instrumentation*."—The earlier opera-composers

Nor is it the caſe, that French critics are thus loud in their teſtimony, while all "the reſt is ſilence." The German ſchool, which may aſſuredly claim ſuch richneſs of production as to tempt a diſdain for what foreign ſchools have brought forth, has recogniſed the ſingular merit of Philidor, in a ſpirit of juſt and dignified appreciation, that might well have been imitated by ſome of his own countrymen. While Frenchmen have been found mean enough to charge one of the moſt ſingle-minded and honeſt of men with ſyſtematic plagiariſm, the higheſt German authorities have diſtinctly avowed, that Philidor ſtood by himſelf, a century ago, in working in the ſpirit of their own later maſters; that not only are his ſcores ſtudied (as they deſerved to be) by every young compoſer, that would ſee real muſic ſeparated from all that is trivial and temporary, but that remarkable evidence of ſuch ſtudy has been given by the cloſe reproduction of ſome of his beauties by a dramatic

(according to Caſtil-Blaze and Fétis) had no *Finales* or larger combinations of voices: "Cependant PHILIDOR (Fétis, *La Muſique miſe à la portée*, etc. p. 160) ſaiſit l'occaſion qui lui fut offerte dans *Tom Jones* pour faire un bon Quatuor."—Grétry (Letter in the *Mercure Français*, 1795) writes,—"Muſicien profond, c'eſt lui qui le premier fit entendre ſur la ſcène françaiſe les accens mélodieux des Italiens joints à la force de l'harmonie et du génie des Allemands . . . Philidor eſt, je crois, l'inventeur des morceaux de muſique à pluſieurs ſujets où à pluſieurs rhythmes contractans. Le duo de *Tom Jones*, '*Que les devoirs que tu m'impoſes*,' eſt le chef-d'œuvre des morceaux de ce genre."

compoſer of their own, who in original creative power ranks ſecond to none.*

If the Operas of Philidor no longer form part of any current repertory, it is ſimply becauſe an audience of the day demands to be ſpoken to in the language and ſpirit of the day, with the multiplied and novel appliances of the day. The orcheſtra of Philidor, a ſtartling and novel one for the old *Foire S. Laurent*, would appear thin and tame by the ſide of the "flutes and trumpets" of the actual *Opéra-Comique*. But although the tide of faſhion, that ſwept away all ſecond-rate productions at once, had begun to ſet in even before Philidor's death, ſuch was the native charm of his lighter works, that they continued to flouriſh on the ſtage, as freſh as ever, ſo late as the

* "Philidor won for himſelf a reputation, which—in the minds of ſuch as really underſtand the ſubject—can never be loſt; for his works are (to ſay all in one word) full of *German* ſtrength and ſolidity. In *Blaiſe* and his other operas, there lives a *German* ſpirit; and it is for this reaſon, that they have been the models of ſome of *our* moſt ſucceſsful compoſers. An *amalgam* with our Carl Maria von Weber is very diſtinctly viſible in a duet of *Tom Jones* and one in *Der Freiſchütz*, viz.: *Que les devoirs que tu m'impoſes!* and *Halt! halt feſt!* Place them ſide by ſide, and the fact will be demonſtrated; the interval of more than half a century vaniſhes, both for feeling and for ſight. The operas of Philidor are given, and received with applauſe, in every part of Europe; and are induſtriouſly ſtudied by all ſuch young compoſers as make it their aim to cut looſe from every kind of *ſing-ſong* and *cling-clang*." (Schindler's *Univerſal Lexicon der Tonkunſt*, Stuttgart, 1837.)

days of the Firſt Napoleon.* Fétis, writing in 1841, affirms, that *Le Maréchal Ferrant* had then been produced in Paris more than two hundred times.†

But, of courſe, it is as a Cheſs-player, that Philidor holds a place among the privileged few, whoſe claim to be the *Primarii*—"the foremoſt men of all the world," in their reſpective ſpheres—has been ſettled by an action, on the part of their fellow-men, as authoritative as it is indefinable—by a tacit admiſſion of ſupremacy, a general and ſpontaneous act of homage. In his own day he ſtood, in the opinion of the actual Cheſs-world, abſolutely alone. Whatever may have been the ſtrength in play of the contemporary theoriſts, Ercole del Rio, Ponziani, and Lolli, it was proved only in a peculiar ſchool and exhibited on an unknown ſtage: it had no effect, therefore, out of the Peninſula, to ſuggeſt the ſlighteſt doubt of the ſupremacy of Philidor. There was nothing, conſequently, to hinder the conviction of Philidor's unique poſition from paſſing beyond the circle of Cheſs-players into the world without—from being

* *Antè*, p. 46.—See alſo Scudo, *Critique* etc. t. ii. p. 474.—When La Bourdonnais, writing ſo late as 1836, (*Biographie*,) ſays, that all of Philidor's operas were forgotten, he excepts *le Maréchal ferrant*.—For a very intereſting analyſis of the *Maréchal ferrant*, ſee the article of M. Pougin already referred to (*antè*, p. 84.)

† We have Lardin's authority for the fact, that the compoſitions of Philidor were ſtill (1841) treated as models, and given out as ſubjects of ſtudy, in the celebrated *Conſervatoire* of Paris.

univerſally recogniſed as a fixed and indiſputable dogma, an immutable tradition. As ſuch it appears, everywhere, among the received commonplaces of works of literature and ſcience. The name of Philidor ſtands out, in the general opinion, as diſtinctly from other names, as does that of Newton. It has acquired a ſacredneſs, that may have had its effect upon the judgments of the Cheſs-critics of a later day. In France, La Bourdonnais and St. Amant did but conform to the univerſal feeling, when they habitually ſpoke of Philidor as their "Maſter," "the Great Maſter," "the Maſter of us all."* The very able Engliſh editor and critic of his book and of his games, George Walker, has everywhere, and in the moſt emphatic terms, characterized Philidor as "the greateſt Cheſs-player that ever lived—the founder of a ſchool, which has proved itſelf ſecond to none—the head of a dynaſty, which has included a Carlier, a Bernard, a Deſchapelles, a La Bourdonnais." Nay, herein Mr. Walker does but echo the equally deciſive but calmer language of his illuſtrious friend,

* It is true, that La Bourdonnais—after having called Philidor (*Palamède*, t. i. p. 392) "le joueur le plus extraordinaire qui ait jamais paru"—argued, in a converſation with the Chevalier de Barneville, that he could have given Philidor the Pawn and Two Moves (*La Régence*, 1851, p. 118.) But, for La Bourdonnais's ſake, it may be well to recollect, that he was, perhaps, (as uſual,) merely joking, and that we have the anecdote upon the authority of M. Méry.

Alexander M'Donnell himſelf.* Many of the foremoſt Cheſs-writers have not heſitated, either directly or by implication, to expreſs the further opinion, that he, who had certainly never met his equal, in his own day, would have undoubtedly ſuſtained the ſame unique poſition, were he to have found himſelf ſeated oppoſite to the adepts, whoſe names have, ſince his day, ſhone with ſo bright a luſtre in the Cheſs-empyrean.†

Of all Cheſs-writers, he who is confeſſedly the firſt in our own day, and ſecond to none that have ever been, has ſhared leſs than moſt others that awe for the Great Shade, which may have influenced the opinions and the expreſſions of La Bourdonnais and St. Amant, of Walker and M'Donnell. Herr VON HEYDEBRAND UND DER LASA has ſcrutinized ſuch monuments, as we have, of Philidor's practical ſkill, with the ſame "judicial compoſure," the ſame abſolute fairneſs, that characterize his critique of the *Analyſe*. The reſult will be found in the ſecond ſection of the Eſſay, with which he has

* "I am very anxious to ſee the Philidor MS. *Philidor is my favourite*; and I prize whatever remains of him." (Autograph Letter to Mr. Walker, in my poſſeſſion.)

† I may cite, for example, a clever writer in the *Quarterly Review* (No. CLXIX, June, 1849, p. 94): "At the riſk of being deemed either old-faſhioned or ignorant, we muſt plead guilty to a concluſion leſs flattering to modern profeſſors. We believe, on the evidence of Philidor's recorded games, that on the whole he has had no ſuperior."

enriched this book of mine. If the reader ſhould, at firſt, find his enthuſiaſm diſagreeably chilled by the abſence of thoſe warm expreſſions of admiration, with which others—ſuch as George Walker and I—inveſt all mention of our Cheſs-hero, he will, in the end, be better ſatisfied, that the received opinion reſts on a ſure baſis, when he hears ſo cool a critic, ſo high an authority, declare his judgment, that there was *no* given meaſure of practical ſkill, which Philidor, in his beſt days, could not have made his own. Forever, therefore, let the Star of Philidor dwell apart. Let us accord to La Bourdonnais and to our own PAUL MORPHY the credit of having attained an actual height, in Cheſs-ſkill, that had never been attained before; but let us, by no ſuch recognition of later and contemporary greatneſs, detract aught from the conſecrated ſupremacy of Philidor.

No words are required to ſhow what Philidor was as a man. With even ſuch ſcanty details as we have of his private life, we feel that we need nothing more. We read him like a fairly written book. The ſun never ſhone upon a human being more perfectly ſimple, ſingle-hearted, and open. He loved his art for itſelf. He therefore felt no jealouſy of Monſigny, no envy of Gluck. He could, with equal ſincerity, mourn the departure of Rameau, and welcome the riſing ſtar of Grétry. As

his Engliſh friends, after his death, dwelt upon what they had witneſſed—his meekneſs and gentleneſs, his diſintereſtedneſs and his probity; ſo Grétry, with more perfect knowledge of what he had been at home, honoured him as a good huſband, a good father, a good friend. It would be hard to believe, that ſuch a man could have adopted, as a companion to ſuch virtues, the wicked and ferocious irreligion of his time. With no evidence to the contrary, it is reaſonable to cheriſh the belief, that he had never abandoned the faith and the impreſſions of his earlieſt training, in daily aſſociation, as it was, with the moſt ſacred offices of religion; and that he was not without the conſolations of religion at his death. And, therefore, if thoſe, who delight to honour his memory, may not be able to read, on any ſepulchral ſtone, the "forlorn *Hic jacet*" of Philidor, they may at leaſt waft after him a devout *Requieſcat in pace!*

PHILIDOR

AS

CHESS-AUTHOR AND CHESS-PLAYER

CONTRIBUTED TO

THE LIFE OF PHILIDOR

AS A SUPPLEMENT

BY

TASSILO VON HEYDEBRAND UND DER LASA

Chamberlain and Legationary Councillor to the King of Prussia
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the King of
Prussia at the Grand Ducal Court of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach
Principal author of the *Handbuch des Schachspiels*
and author of *Leitfaden für Schachspieler*
Berliner Schacherinnerungen
and many Papers on
CHESS.

The following Eſſay was written at Rio Janeiro, in the winter of 1858-59, during the author's reſidence in that capital as *Chargé d'affaires* of the King of Pruſſia. It was ſent to me in the original German, for tranſlation, with the requeſt, that I would add to it Notes of my own. If the reader knew, as well as I do, with what force and propriety Herr von der Laſa expreſſes himſelf in our language, he would regret that the original had not been written in Engliſh at once. He will, at any rate, think none the worſe of my taſte for limiting my Notes to a few references or illuſtrations.

G. A.

PHILIDOR

AS CHESS-AUTHOR AND CHESS-PLAYER.

IN the following Eſſay, which is offered as a Supplement to the *Life of* PHILIDOR, it is propoſed to diſcuſs the merit, which the *Analyſe* may poſſeſs, as a work of Chefs-theory, and to attempt ſome eſtimate of the Cheſs-ſkill of its author, in compariſon—ſo far, at leaſt, as ſuch compariſon is admiſſible or practicable—with that of later and contemporary players.

I.

PHILIDOR AS CHESS-AUTHOR.

PHILIDOR was indebted for his world-wide celebrity, not ſolely to his ſuperiority in actual play over thoſe of his contemporaries, whom he met over the board, but alſo as well to his perſonal relations with many men of high rank and diſtinction, as to the

wide circulation, which his *Analyſe* attained, as the compendium of what was, in that age, known of Cheſs-play, outſide of Italy. Of all French Cheſs-authors, Philidor is the only one, whoſe work has made an epoch in the hiſtory of the game. No other production, in all Cheſs-literature, has been ſo frequently reprinted, both in the original French, and in moſt of the languages of modern Europe. We recogniſe in it, at once, the production of a comprehenſive mind, ſtill bearing marks of youthful exuberance, but endowed with a rare talent for the clear exhibition of its ideas. The work has been judged of very differently by different critics. Thoſe who pay an excluſive homage to a ſyſtem, identical with that of the *Analyſe*, have certainly rated its value too high. Others —Ponziani, for example—who have directed their attention to the *openings*, with little or no reference to the ſubſequent proſecution of the game, have as evidently rated it too low. Philidor himſelf was full of confidence in his own capacity and in the value of his treatiſe. In the Preface to his firſt edition, he ſpeaks ſlightingly enough of "*Le Calabrois*" and of Bertin—of the "big volume" of Carrera, wherein the good prieſt affirms, that the checkmate by Rook and Biſhop againſt Rook is a forced one, without being able (Philidor intimates) to give the moves—and of the artificial Poſitions, which could not occur in actual play ſo often as once in a thouſand years. His own principal object (he continues) is to deſerve commendation by a novelty, of which nobody before him had ever thought or perhaps been capable, namely, to teach, by means of entire games, the proper

mode of playing the Pawns. "The Pawns" (he ſays) "are the *Soul* of Cheſs;" and it is upon the good or bad playing of the Pawns, that the winning or the loſing of the game entirely depends. This rather petulant Introduction—wherein the author rejects, with mockery and ſarcaſm, the doctrine, that a Pawn can become a ſecond Queen (although at a later day he accepted it)—was quietly dropt in the edition of 1777, and replaced by a ſhorter one.

Philidor's treatiſe embraced, in its firſt edition of 1749, only nine games, with their variations. Of theſe games four are *Common*, viz.:—No. I. is the *King's Biſhop's Game;* No. II. the *Queen's Biſhop's Pawn's Defence* in the King's Biſhop's Game; No. III. *Philidor's Defence* in the King's Knight's Game; and No. IV. is the *Queen's Biſhop's Pawn's Game.* After theſe follow *Gambits*, viz., the *King's Gambit Proper;* the *Cunningham Gambit;* the *Biſhop's Gambit;* the *King's Gambit declined;* and then the *Queen's Gambit*—a game eſpecially commended by Stamma, and which Philidor—with evident reference to this circumſtance—calls the *Aleppo Gambit.* There is alſo thrown into the bargain, as it were, a certain checkmate with Rook and Biſhop againſt Rook, which, however, although a model of clear and preciſe analyſis, does not entirely demonſtrate the aſſertion of Carrera. The ſpecimens of play, which Philidor furniſhed, in his firſt edition, were deſigned chiefly to give the Cheſs-ſtudent a clue to guide him ſafely through the *middle* of the game. Few as they are in number, only the four firſt, even of theſe, were looked upon by him, as calculated to

illuſtrate his ſyſtem. The ſtudy of ſuch a collection, therefore, muſt be entirely inſufficient for conveying a knowledge of the *openings*. For this reaſon, the author, in his ſecond edition (1777)—which repeats without change all the moves of the firſt, with only here and there a modification of the notes—adds a few ſhort openings, at the cloſe. It is much to be regretted, that during the interval between his two editions, Philidor had not come to know the three great Maſters, who at that time were flouriſhing in Modena. A meeting with Ercole del Rio, the moſt celebrated of the three, would not only have produced games of peculiar intereſt, as being conteſts between the repreſentatives of two different ſyſtems, but would alſo naturally have exerted a powerful influence upon the aims and labours of theoriſts on both ſides of the Alps. But this great event the Cheſs-world was not permitted to ſee.

Philidor's edition of 1777 is, therefore, even in its additional matter, penetrated by the ſame ſpirit as the earlier one. The *Games*, with the inſtructive *Notes* appended to them, ſtill form the ſtaple of the work. Theſe conſtitute the expoſition of a peculiar ſyſtem, the characteriſtic features of which, contraſted with thoſe of the Italian ſchool, I have endeavoured to give, in an eſſay of ſome length, contributed to the Berlin *Schachzeitung* for 1847 and 1848. It can hardly be poſſible, that theſe model Games ever occurred in actual play: they were, undoubtedly, compoſed by Philidor himſelf for his work. They are diſtinctively characterized by the thoroughly conſequent and ſyſtematic ſtyle of their Pawn-play, and

by the manner in which they make uſe of the central Pawns to ſecure cloſeneſs of poſition. They cannot, however, be ſaid to have been conſtructed upon principles abſolutely new; they are, more properly, the offſpring of the prevailing theories of the day—theories that were baſed far more upon the games of Lopez, (of whoſe work there had been ſeveral editions in French,) than upon thoſe of Greco, in which the ſpirit of the Italian ſchool was decidedly preponderant. The little book of the Engliſhman Bertin (1735,) and Stamma's Openings (1745,) do in fact belong to the ſame ſchool as the *Analyſe*: what Philidor did was to perfect and expound the *ſyſtem* of that ſchool. When we examine the work in this light—taking into account alſo the youthful years of the author in 1749—it is impoſſible not to concede to Philidor a precocious maſtery of all the recondite ſubtilities of the game, and an extraordinary gift of exhibiting his ideas in a clear and comprehenſive plan. The mark which Philidor aimed at was high and worthy of a great maſter. And yet he would hardly have ventured upon the execution of the taſk he had propoſed to himſelf, if he had been fully aware how wide a field was really embraced by it—if he had not, like his contemporaries, reſtricted his obſervation to the one-ſided "Pawn game" alone. Nevertheleſs the *Analyſe*—even in the ſhape wherein it firſt appeared, in 1749—abundantly proves, that its author poſſeſſed a remarkable talent for dealing with the ſcience of the game. This is a gift, which many other great players have not poſſeſſed. I do not prove this by inſtancing in the celebrated, but

weak, *Traité des Amateurs*, becauſe I do not conſider that work to have been produced by "great players," of a claſs to compare with Philidor. But La Bourdonnais is a caſe in point. Although endowed with the very higheſt order of genius for the practice of the game, he has left behind him, in his theoretical work, only a very middling ſort of compilation.* I may cite alſo Deschapelles, another Hero of the later age, from whom, as an antagoniſt in play, La Bourdonnais acquired much of his ſkill. That great player never gave himſelf the ſlighteſt trouble about the theory of the game; nay, he rated Cheſs-ſcience ſo low, that when a move propoſed by himſelf, in one of the famous correſpondence-games with Peſth, was objected to, on grounds of Cheſs-theory, as not the ſtrongeſt, he could think of no better way to decide the difference between Cheſs-ſcience and himſelf, than to challenge the entire Committee to play out the reſt of the game with him, over the board, for a wager. He immediately reſigned his place in the Committee, when they declined accepting this ſingular *cartel*.

The *Analyſe* contains many propoſitions, aſſerted by Philidor with too much confidence in 1749, which, at maturer years, he was not diſpoſed to maintain, and therefore diſcarded in his ſecond edition. The fact, however, that he had once aſſerted ſuch propoſitions, continued, even after he had withdrawn them, to affect prejudicially his authority as a theoriſt. To theſe in-

* "Le pauvre La Bourdonnais et ſon pauvre livre!" "Déteſtable compilation!" are ſome of the flowers ſcattered by M. le Viceroi St. Amant upon the *Nouveau Traité* of his Sovereign.—Tr.

ſtances of youthful raſhneſs belong the unfounded cenſure, which he pronounced, in 1749, upon the *King's Knight's Game*, the favourite opening of the Italians,—the Notes on the third move in the Second Game, (*Queen's Biſhop's Pawn's Defence* in the King's Biſhop's Game,) with the illuſtrative Firſt Back-game,—and the Notes on the opening moves of the Fourth Game—Notes, from which it might be inferred, that Philidor (like Carrera, 1617, p. 74) held the opinion, that to have the firſt move was to win the game. On the other hand, if we find theſe few untenable precepts in the *Analyſe*, we alſo find Notes, which enunciate very ſtriking general propoſitions, and Games decided by moves well thought through, and univerſally recogniſed to be the ſtrongeſt. At the ſame time, there is no lack, either in the openings, or in the ſubſequent moves, of ſuch overſights, as we can account for, only by ſuppoſing, that the author gave more attention to the general character and main tendency of the games, than to the analytical accuracy of each move. How otherwiſe—to cite only one example—can we account for it, that Philidor ſhould play out, to the advantage of Black, the poſition in which his Cunningham-Gambit game ſtands after the 29th move of Black, in the Second Variation?*

He had taken ſides with Black, and therefore remarks, (in reference to this Poſition, on which he beſtows par-

* The Poſition is: WHITE—King at KR; Rook at QB7; Biſhops at K3 and QR4; Knight at KB; Pawns at Q4, QKt5, and QR3. BLACK—King at KKt3; Rook at Q2; Biſhop at K3; Knight at K2; Pawns at KR4, KKt4, K5, Q4, QKt2, and QR2.

ticular attention,) that White would loſe, juſt as well, were he even to avoid the exchange of Rooks. Philidor purſues the game as follows:* (White) 30. R ; R, (Black) B : R ; and thereupon continues with 31. K Kt2, KRP on ; 32. QB KB2, K KR4 ; 33. KB Q†, B covers ; inſtead of allowing White to make the deciſive move, 31. *QKtP on*. Without ſtirring the queſtion, who was the author of this move, it is ſufficient for my preſent purpoſe to ſay, that it is mentioned in Walker's edition of the *Analyſe*, 1832.†

But I will here repeat the earlier moves of this Gambit, in order to attach to them a few notes, and to invite

* It being obviouſly neceſſary to ſubſtitute, for the "algebraic" notation employed by the author, one more familiar to Engliſh and American Cheſs-players, I have adopted ſubſtantially that which appears in the later publications of George Walker, partly becauſe three of the games, cited in the Eſſay, were copied from Walker's *Selection*, and partly becauſe I do myſelf prefer Walker's to any other form of deſcriptive notation, as being the moſt compendious reproduction of the real language of Cheſs-players over the board. For the convenience of the printer, I have made the ſlight change of adopting from German Cheſs-books a colon (:) as equal to "takes," and the dagger (†) for "checks" or "checking."—Tr.

† Walker's note is, "You may now get a fine game, *e. g.*, 31. QKtP on, B QB3 ; 32. P : P, QKtP2 ; 33. KB : P, B QR ; 34. Kt Kt3, and ought to win." The move 31. QKtP on appears firſt (ſo far as I know) in Pratt's *Studies in Cheſs*, 1810, vol. ii. p. 17, where it introduces a "Variation *by the Editor*." Herr von der Laſa, I ſuppoſe, does not conſider the claim thus aſſerted to be put beyond all queſtion, inaſmuch as honeſt Peter was certainly abſolutely incapable of inventing any ſtrong move whatſoever, not to ſay a ſtronger move than one of Philidor's.—Tr.

attention to a ſlip or two, which Philidor has made in this part of the game alſo. 1. KP2, KP2; 2. KBP2, P:P; 3. KKtB3, KBK2; 4. BQB4, KBKR5†; 5. KtP covers, P:P; 6. Caſtles, P:P†; 7. K to corner. Philidor gives to this variation of the Knight's Gambit, as Stamma had done before him, (although Stamma continues with 7. .... QP2,) the name of "*Cunningham's Gambit.*" The earlier Engliſh author, Bertin, however, (whoſe little book, now ſo very rare, Philidor was acquainted with,) calls it merely *The Three Pawns Game*, without attaching to it the name of any inventor. It has, therefore, been aſſumed by ſome writers, (as, for example, by Cochrane, 1822, p. 357,) that Bertin himſelf was the real inventor of this bold game. On this point, nothing can be affirmed with certainty. Philidor proceeds thus: BKB3; 8. KP on, QP2; 9. KP:B, Kt:P; 10. KBQKt3. Here Bertin (p. 6) makes Black caſtle; and then, after 11. *QP2, KRP1*, ſtops ſhort, with the remark—"And the players may finiſh the game," without expreſſing any opinion which ſhould win. In another place, however, he makes a general remark, from which we can ſee, that he, as Philidor did after him, conſiders Black to have the beſt of it; to the tenth, namely, of his Rules (p. vi) he adds theſe words: "But the defence, if well played, is ſtill the beſt againſt the gambits, in which you change all your pieces, except the gambit that gives three pawns, [in] which [it] will be neceſſary to keep a rook, to conduct your pawns to the queen."

Philidor continues the game thus: QBK3; (*Second*

Variation) 11. QP 2, KKt K5. This Variation is furniſhed by him in order to juſtify the cenſure, which he had pronounced on QP2 as the eleventh move of White, namely, that by ſo playing (inſtead of *QP*1) White would make an opening for Black's Knights, and thus ſpeedily loſe the game. It will be ſeen, however, that preciſely in conſequence of the entry of Black's Knight into White's game, (by KKt K5,) and by the conſequent move of the King's Biſhop's Pawn (KBP2) to ſupport the Knight there, Black expoſes himſelf, in Philidor's own continuation of the game, to very ſerious attacks. 12. QB KB4, KBP2; 13. QKt Q2, Q K2; 14. QBP2, QBP1; 15. P: P, P: P; 16. QR QB, QKt B3; 17. Kt: Kt, KBP: Kt; 18. Kt: Gambit P. (Here, by the way, Cozio [1766, vol. ii. p. 375] more correctly plays *Kt K*5, with the advantage on White's ſide.) Caſtles KR; 19. Q Q2, KRP1. Another very queſtionable move. White would win, were he to take advantage of it by making the attack given in Bilguer's *Handbuch*, viz., 20. *QB: KRP*. But Philidor proceeds: 20. QR QB5, QR Q; 21. KB QR4, KKtP2; 22. QB K3, R: R†; 23. Kt: R, Q Q3; 24. Q KR2, K Kt2; 25. Q: Q, R: Q; 26. QRP1, K Kt3; 27. QKtP2, KRP1; 28. QKtP on, Kt K2; 29. R QB7, R Q2; which brings us to the poſition, from which we ſet out.

II.

PHILIDOR AS CHESS-PLAYER.

HAVING thus examined the *Analyſe*, in reference to its value as a work of Cheſs-theory, it now remains to infer from it, what was Philidor's ſtrength in actual play. Such inferences, it muſt be owned, are by no means certain, inaſmuch as authors rarely appear ſo ſtrong in their works, as in games played over the board. In the preſent caſe, however, it can be aſſerted with confidence, that, in ſpite of ſeveral inaccuracies in the *Analyſe*, we derive from it a higher opinion of Philidor's ſtrength in play, than from the games, (of which we have a conſiderable number,) which he played blindfold, or over the board at odds. Nearly all of the genuine games, that have been preſerved to us of Philidor and other players of his day, were publiſhed by Mr. George Walker, in 1835, in a ſmall volume, under the title of *A Selection of Games at Cheſs played by Philidor and his Contemporaries*. This author, who has enriched ſo many departments of Cheſs-literature by his valuable contributions, was enabled to throw ſome light upon the Philidorian Age, by becoming the fortunate purchaſer of the Rev. George Atwood's Cheſs MSS., when the library of that celebrated mathematician was expoſed to ſale by auction. Mr. Atwood was known to have been among the admirers and aſſociates of Philidor, and to have been himſelf, moreover, no mean Cheſs-player. His MSS.

proved to be his own record of many games, played, between 1780 and 1800, by Count Brühl, Mr. Wilſon, Dr. Bowdler, Lord Harrowby, the Hon. Mr. Conway, Mr. Cotter, and Mr. Leyceſter, with De Beaurevoir, Philidor, Verdoni, and Mr. Atwood himſelf. Theſe ſpecimens are highly intereſting to the ſtudious inquirer; but—to ſpeak quite frankly—they give no very high idea of the Cheſs-ſkill of that day. Philidor, at any rate, was then in the evening of his life. In theſe games, the Old Maſter does indeed ſtand, under the keen inſpection of our eyes, far higher than his fellows; but he is by no means ſecure againſt committing, now and then, a ſtriking overſight. To explain how this ſhould happen, one or two circumſtances muſt be taken into conſideration. Philidor had, at that time, croſſed the boundary of threeſcore, and had, therefore, moſt certainly, long ſince left behind him the period of his greateſt ſtrength as a player,—a period, which cannot be conſidered as extending, upon an average, beyond the fortieth year of life. Nay, I am diſpoſed to believe, that the limit of the moſt perfect correctneſs in play is, in very many caſes, reached conſiderably earlier: the long-continued occupation with the buſineſs of life acts, with weakening effect, upon the power of *attention*, ſo eſſentially requiſite in Cheſs.

The ſecond conſideration, that operates to mitigate the ſeverity of our judgment, reſts upon the fact, that Philidor's adverſaries were players of only moderate ſtrength. Their weak and inaccurate ſtyle of play could not remain without its effect upon him. For it is a truth, well eſtabliſhed by experience, that ſtrong players, when engaged

with weak ones, can exert themſelves only ſo far as to make ſure of victory in a majority of games. The intenſity, with which they exert their faculty of combination, is at firſt relaxed by careleſſneſs, and afterwards by a haſtineſs, that has become a habit. To play, moreover, giving heavy odds, although it may compel the ſtronger player to exert his attention, does, nevertheleſs, affect him injuriouſly, upon the whole; becauſe, in ſuch games, he calculates of courſe, and may calculate too much, upon the overſights of his adverſary.

If, under theſe complicated relations of the queſtion, it is difficult to form a juſt eſtimate of Philidor's real ſtrength, in compariſon with that of his contemporaries, it cannot but be doubly difficult to bring an earlier age into compariſon with a later one—eſpecially when the later age is characterized by its remarkable advancement in Cheſs-ſcience—and to determine how Philidor would rank among the players of the preſent day. The opinion, which I have, nevertheleſs, formed, is, that Philidor, when in the fulneſs and freſhneſs of his ſtrength, with the ſolid ſupport of his talent for analyſis, muſt have poſſeſſed the capacity to make his own any given meaſure of practical ſkill; but that his Cheſs-faculty had, by no means, attained, among ſuch contemporaries, its higheſt poſſible degree of development; and that he, therefore, falls ſomewhat ſhort of that accuracy of conception and that richneſs of combination, which we behold with wonder in the victorious conteſt of La Bourdonnais againſt the united book-knowledge and genius of M'Donnell.

The judgment, which I have thus pronounced upon

Philidor and his Age, to many may appear to be unjuſt. To give the reader an opportunity, therefore, to judge of its fairneſs and its ſoundneſs, I ſhall proceed to lay before him a few games from Mr. Walker's publication, with the accompaniment of ſome notes of my own. Before doing ſo, however, I muſt devote a few words to Philidor's playing without ſight of board and men, or "blindfold playing" (ſo called.) Nine ſuch games of his—each *triad* whereof was played ſimultaneouſly—are familiar to all Engliſh-reading Cheſs-ſtudents, inaſmuch as they are contained in every current edition of PHILIDOR *on Cheſs*. They firſt appeared in the new edition of the *Analyſe*, which was publiſhed in the Engliſh language, at London, in 1790. This edition, which—if it had been really prepared by Philidor, as it bears his name, would be the third edition—exhibits indications, in the Preface and elſewhere, by which we recogniſe the fact, that it was merely ſuperintended by the Publiſher in the Author's name. The games in queſtion belong to the years 1783, 1788, and 1790—to Philidor's old age, therefore; but even had they been the fruit of an earlier period, they could furniſh no criterion of his ordinary play. Their ſpecial intereſt conſiſts in the evidence, which they furniſh, of Philidor's rare gift of imaginative preſentation,—the power of keeping boards and men clearly before his "mind's eye,"—a gift that may be compared to the peculiar talent of thoſe mental arithmeticians, who aſtound us by the portentous computations, which they carry on in their head alone. It is worthy of remark, that Philidor ſhould have retained this gift to the day of his death.

He never exhibited it, however—ſo far as the number of his ſimultaneous games is concerned—in the fulleſt extent, to which it has been cultivated. Greater feats, of this kind, had been performed before his time; greater feats have alſo been performed in our own day, when Mr. Louis Paulſen plays blindfold *ten* games at once.* Among the Aſiatics, during the middle Ages, blindfold playing was ſo much a favourite mode of play, that the Oriental Cheſs-authors give ſpecial inſtructions for it. In this way we learn the fact, that Aſiatic amateurs, who could conduct three or four blindfold games at once, and at the ſame time recite verſes, were by no means rare. Nay, there is alſo ſaid to have been one player, in the Eaſt, who had gone to the extent of playing ſo many as ten ſuch games at once.† Theſe examples go far beyond what Philidor's art ever achieved. Several games in Walker's *Selection* ſhow, that Philidor, blindfold, played even with antagoniſts, to whom, over the board, he was accuſtomed to give the Queen's Knight for the King's Biſhop's Pawn and the move. And, upon the whole, it is reckoned, that Philidor, in blindfold play, was about a Pawn under his uſual ſtrength.

To proceed with the games from Walker's *Selection*. In 1788, Philidor gives the Pawn and two moves to M.

* In a letter, written ſome time after the date of the Eſſay, the author expreſſes his regret, that no account of Paul Morphy's blindfold playing, at Birmingham and in the *Café de la Régence*, had reached him, in ſeaſon to enable him to place the name of the young American maſter by the ſide of Mr. Paulſen's.—Tr.

† Bland's *Perſian Cheſs*, p. 24.

de Beaurevoir. This gentleman, being at that time (according to Mr. Walker) a Chefs-player of high ſtanding in France, had expected to be able to make a ſtand againſt Philidor at the Pawn and *one* move. He was beaten, notwithſtanding, at the larger odds. Although the games of this match are by no means free from errors, they exhibit, in many places, a maſterly judgment of poſition, on the part of Philidor. It muſt alſo be obſerved, that his adverſary was not remarkably ſtrong. He not only allowed himſelf to be viſibly frightened by Philidor's play—as often happens to the weaker party in ſuch a match—but in fact he really poſſeſſed hardly ſuch a meaſure of talent, as would conſtitute him, at the preſent day, what is called a "ſecond-rate" player—ſuch a player as uſually wins not more than one even game out of five from a maſter in Chefs.

First Game. (Remove Black's KBP from the board.) 1. (M. de Beaurevoir) KP2; 2. QP2, (Philidor) KP1; 3. KBP2. (KBP2 is no longer recommended at the preſent day; but formerly it was the uſual move. I do not, therefore, condemn it as weak play on the part of Beaurevoir.) QP2; 4. KP on, QBP2; 5. QBP1, QKt B3; 6. KKt B3, Q QKt3; 7. QRP1, QRP2; 8. QRP on. (The two laſt moves of White ſhow that he had as yet formed no plan how to uſe his Pieces for an attack—a proof either of embarraſſment through fear, or of natural want of energy.) KKt R3; 9. KB Q3, QB Q2; 10. QKt R3, Caſtles; 11. QKt Kt5, KKt B2; 12. QB K3, QBP on; 13. KB QB2. (This retreat of the Biſhop is diſadvantageous. It would do better to go to *K2*, in

order to maintain the attack on Black's QB P. If Philidor ſhould, thereupon, make the ſame move as he does in the actual game, White would get a very good attack: *e. g.*, 13. *KB K2, QKt Kt;* 14. *QKtP* 1, *QB: Kt;* 15. *P: B, Q: P;* 16. *KKt Q2*, or *QKtP: P, QP: P;* 17. *QR R4, Q QKt* 7; 18. *QB* home, *Q: QBP*†; 19. *B* covers, *Q QKt*7; 20. *KB: P*, with a deciſive attack.) QKt Kt; 14. QKt R3, Q: QKtP. (White would have done better to play 14. *Caſtles, B: Kt;* 15. *P: B, Q: P;* 16. *Q Q2.*) 15. Kt QKt 5. (Here White ſacrifices a Pawn, *poſſibly* for the purpoſe of getting room for his attack, but *probably* becauſe he failed to ſee, that 15. *Q QB* would make his game ſafe at every point: Black could not then take *QBP* without loſing his Queen.) B: Kt; 16. P: B, Q: QKtP; 17. KB QR4, Q QR3. (In hopes of getting a chance to play *QKtP2*, which would clear a ſpace for defenſive purpoſes. But the combination does not ſucceed. The Queen might have alſo drawn back to *QKt3*; but ſhe could not have gone afterwards to *QB2*: the defence of *QKtP* would then have been too difficult.) 18. QR QKt, KB K2; 19. Caſtles, Q QR2 (a *coup de repos*;) 20. Q QB2, KKtP1; 21. R QKt5. (A ſingularly unſkilful move. Black takes advantage of it immediately, to provide the neceſſary protection for his *QKtP.*) R Q2; 22. KR QKt, KKt Q; 23. R QKt6, KKt QB 3; 24. KKtP2, KR KB; 25. KRP2, R QB2; 26. K Kt2. (A blunder. White now had a chance to call back his Rook from the idle adventure on which it had gone to *QKt6*, and ſo prevent its being cut off by *Kt QKt5*. After doing this, he might

have attempted, with the help of a Rook, to make a breach in Black's line of defence on the King's ſide. The Black Queen is ſtill in an unfavourable poſition, and could not readily come to the reſcue of the other wing.) Kt Q Kt 5; 27. Q R : Kt, P : R; 28. P : P, Q Kt P 2. (Black loſes no time to ſecure greater freedom of movement.) 29. K B : P, R Q Kt 2; 30. K B : P. (White could have drawn his Biſhop back, with the loſs of a Pawn, to *Q R* 4. The ſacrifice of 30. *B : P* is, perhaps, founded on a bold, but unſound, combination, which—even if it could have been completely carried out—would not have been deciſive for White, viz.: 30. *B : P, P : B;* 31. *Q : P*†, *K Q* 2; 32. *Q P* on, *Q : B;* 33. *P : P*†, *K* home; 34. *Q B* 8†, *B* covers, &c.) R Q B 2; 31. Kt Q 2, P : B; 32. Kt : P, Q Q Kt 2†; 33. K Kt 3, Q Kt R 3; 34. Q K 2, Kt : P. (Black could alſo have firſt played 33. *Q Kt* 4; and then, upon 34. *R Q B, Kt Q R* 3; [35. *Q K* 2, *K Kt;*] 35. *Q P* on, and *then B : P.*) 35. Kt Q 6†, B : Kt; 36. P : B, R Q B 6; 37. K R 2, R Q B 7; 38. Q B Q 2, K R : P. (Black's laſt move was a blunder—ſuch a blunder as ſhould never be made by a Maſter in Cheſs. *K R : P* gives White a chance poſſibly to draw the game; whereas *K Q* 2 would have been a winning move. But White, as we ſhall ſee, does not avail himſelf of the chance thus given him. He replies with 39. *Q : P*†, without duly weighing all the conſequences of the move. His attention may have been directed excluſively to the following combination: 39. *R : Kt, Q : R;* 40. *Q : K P*†, *K Q Kt* 2; [41. *Q K* 7†, *K Q R* 3; 42. *Q K* 2†, *Q* covers, or *K Kt* 3, &c.] 41. *Q Q* 7†, *K Q R* 3; 42. *K Kt* 3, *Q : Q P;*

43. *B: R*, Q Q6†, &c.) 39. Q: P†, K Q. (If Black had moved inſtead to Q Kt, he would juſt as little have cut off White's chance to draw, as may be ſeen by the following moves: 40. *Q K8*†, [*R QB*; 41. *B: KR*,] *K QR7*; 41. Q QR4†, Q covers; 42. Q Q7†, *K* to corner; 43. Q *K8*†, *R* covers; 44. *P Q7*, &c.) 40. Q KKt8†, K Q2; 41. Q: P†, K B. (White could now draw by perpetual check.) 42. Q: Q†, K: Q; 43. R: Kt†, K B3; 44. K attacks R, KR KB8; 45. P Q5†, K: firſt P. (Beaurevoir appears not to have been well ſkilled in end-games; otherwiſe, he would have played *B K3*, or ſtill better *B KB4*, becauſe the Biſhop, beſides protecting the Pawn, is alſo for the moment protected by the King.) 46. R Q4, K K4; 47. R Q3, K attacks R; 48. R K3†, K: P; 49. R Q3†. (White acts evidently upon the erroneous impreſſion, that he is obliged to keep the Biſhop at Q2.) K K5; 50. R K3†, K Q5; 51. R K2, K attacks R; 52. R attacks P, K: B; 53. R: P, QR B6†; 54. K attacks R, KR B6; 55. KRP on, QR K6; 56. KRP on, K K7 and wins.

Second Game. (Remove Black's KBP from the board.) 1. (M. de Beaurevoir) QP2; 2. QBP2, (Philidor) KP1; 3. KP2, KKtP1; 4. KBP2. (I make no ſort of remark upon theſe introductory moves, becauſe ſkill in the openings depends upon ſtudy; and this branch of Cheſs-ſtudy is far more advanced now, than it was in the time of Philidor. I reſerve all criticiſm for the game proper.) QP2; 5. QBP: P, KP: P; 6. KP on, QBP2; 7. KB Q Kt5†, QKt B3; 8. QKt B3, QRP1; 9. B: Kt†, P: B; 10. QB K3, P: P; 11. Q: P, KKt R3; 12. Q QKt6.

(In games at odds, the ſecond player has uſually a bad poſition, and is glad to bring about an exchange of Queens. Here it is White that offers the exchange. The poſition has, however, by this time become about equal, and I will not, therefore, condemn Q QKt6 as a ſin againſt a general principle. The move is, nevertheleſs, to be blamed, becauſe it muſt bring White into a bad poſition, or cauſe him the loſs of a Pawn.) Q : Q; 13. B : Q, QR attacks B; 14. QKt R4, KB QKt5†; 15. K K2, Caſtles; 16. QRP1, KB K2; 17. KKtP1, QBP on; 18. QR QKt, (a perfectly uſeleſs move,) QB attacks R; 19. QR Q, QB K5; 20. KKt B3, QB QB7. (The Biſhop might have gone at once to *QB7*. In that caſe, White's *KKt* would have kept his place. Beaurevoir was, I ſuſpect, a player, to whom Philidor could have given the Knight: the Maſter, therefore, plays careleſſly.) 21. QB : P, B : R†; 22. R : B, B : B; 23. Kt : B, R : P†; 24. K B, Kt KB4; 25. R Q3, KR QB; 26. Kt QKt3, KR QB7; 27. QKt Q2, QP on; 28. K K2, QR QR7; 29. Kt : P. (White ſhould have prepared this move by *KKt P* on. Philidor, however, did not take advantage of the blunder, which ought (as Walker remarks) to have coſt White the loſs of a Piece.) Kt : Kt. (*R : Kt*† would have been the better move. Both this game and that which follows it exhibit ſuch ſerious blemiſhes that I ſhould not aſcribe them to Philidor, if there were the ſlighteſt reaſon to doubt the genuineneſs of the Atwood MSS., which Walker made uſe of for his *Selection*.—I may take this occaſion alſo to guard myſelf againſt the ſuſpicion of having, on purpoſe, choſen defective games, in order to make

out my caſe: the games, which I am now annotating, are taken preciſely as they come—the three firſt—in Walker's book.) 30. R : Kt, R : P; 31. KtP on, QR KR6; 32. KBP on, R : P†; 33. K Q, KR : Kt†; 34. R : R, R : R†; 35. K : R, P : P; 36. P : P, KRP2; 37. KP on, QRP on and wins.

THIRD GAME. (Remove Black's KBP from the board.) 1. (M. de Beaurevoir) KP2; 2. QP2, (Philidor) KP1; 3. QBP2, KKtP1; 4. KBP2, QP2; 5. QBP : P, P : P; 6. KP on, QBP2; 7. KB QKt5†, QKt B3. (Thus far this game is quite like the ſecond; only that a move or two are tranſpoſed. The players appear, therefore, to have had a good memory for the mode, in which they had played before. The two firſt games were played at the ſame ſitting, on the 31ſt of May, 1788. The third followed in April.) 8. KKt B3, Q QKt3; 9. QKt B3, P : P; 10. KKt : P, KB pins Kt; 11. QB K3, KKt K2; 12. QRP1, KB QB4.

(Walker, who accompanies the games with only here and there a note, ſays here, that (Black) 12. *KB : QKt*† would *apparently* have been better. It is clear, therefore, that he perceived, as little as Beaurevoir, (who continued with 13. QKtP2,) the groſs blunder, which Black had fallen into—a blunder, which ſhould have coſt him a Piece. The overſight is all the more ſtriking, that the Biſhop—if it had been well for him to ſtand at QB4—could have gone thither two moves earlier, inſtead of going to QKt5. At that moment, *KB QB4* could have been made without diſadvantage. The conſequences would have been ſomewhat as follows:—11. *QKt QR4*,

Q QR4†; 12. QB covers, *KB QKt5*; 13. *QKt B3*, *KKt K2*; 14. *Caſtles*. The following Variation ſhows the neceſſary conſequences of the moves actually made:—13. *QKt QR4*, Q checks; 14. *QKtP* covers, *KB: P*†; 15. *QRP: B*, *Q: P*†; 16. *K B2*. There is no ſtrength in Black's paſſed Pawns. The poſition of his Queen is bad likewiſe. Beſides, White can force an exchange of Queens, if he likes. In an ancient Perſian MS., preſented by Major Yule to the Britiſh Muſeum, (No. 151,) and deſcribed by Bland, (pp. 18–25,) we find it related, that "in India there was a player, who, during forty years, never had a Pawn taken from him gratis." The Perſian author adds, "*We* have never beheld ſucceſs like this." That ancient Indian Cheſs-player muſt have poſſeſſed the power of attention in a far higher degree than Philidor in 1788.)

The Game proceeds—13. QKtP2, B: Kt; 14. B: B, Q QB2; 15. QB QB5, QB K3; 16. QB: Kt, Q: B; 17. Kt: P, Q Q (Black's game is deſperate;) 18. Kt KB6†, K B2; 19. Q KB3, Q QKt3; 20. B: Kt, P: B; 21. Kt K4, B pins Kt; 22. Kt Q6†, K Kt2; 23. Q KB2, KR KB; 24. KR B, QR Q (in hopes, evidently, to get ſome chance to take off the Knight, who was ſteadily maintaining his poſition;) 25. Q: Q, P: Q; 26. KKtP1, KRP2; 27. KRP2, (a move by no means unwelcome to Black, inaſmuch as it takes from the ſtrength of the White Pawns, and gives greater ſecurity to the connexion between Black's Biſhop and his Pawns.) QKtP on, (thus getting all his Pawns on white ſquares.) 28. K B2, R: Kt. (Walker remarks on this move, which Black had

been for a long time getting ready to make, that "the ſacrifice was uncalled for." But upon this move hung Black's laſt hope of poſſibly drawing the game; becauſe by getting the troubleſome Knight out of the way, the Biſhop gains in ſtrength. Although Philidor did not ſucceed, even by this move, in extricating himſelf entirely from his difficulties, he nevertheleſs proved himſelf to have been a far abler judge of the poſition, than the Editor of his games.) 29. P : R, KR Q; 30. KR K, R : QP; 31. KR K5, B K3; (becauſe, poſted here, the Biſhop cloſes up the game, commands the ſquares at KB4 and KKt5, and releaſes the Rook, which otherwiſe was threatened with being ſhut up by *QR Q.*) 32. QR K, K B3.

Walker remarks that the game was drawn, but that "the remainder was, unfortunately, not taken down." Beaurevoir (he adds) "could only have allowed his adverſary to draw the game through ſome important miſcalculation," inaſmuch as he had "a decided advantage." From theſe words it is clear, that Walker did not entirely underſtand the nature of this end-game. Beaurevoir cannot have played *R : B*†, or this very elegant and deciſive move (which evidently was not thought of by Walker) would have been noted down and preſerved with the reſt. White failed of winning the game, I ſuſpect, becauſe he was not fully aware of the Biſhop's ſtrength for defence, and therefore did not take him off at all, or took him off in a leſs favourable poſition than the preſent. The conſequences of taking him off at this moment would have been as follows:—1. *R : B*†, *R : R*; 2. *R : R*†, *K : R*; 3. *K B3*, *K B4*; 4. *KtP*†, *P : P*†; 5.

KKt3, *KK3*; 6. *K: P*, *KB3*; 7. *KBP* on, *P: P*†; 8. *KB4* and wins, becauſe, while the Black King is taking *KRP*, the White King will be moving over to the other ſide of the board, and the Black King will be too far behind him to be able to protect his Pawns at *QB3* and *QKt4*. There are other Variations, (as *e. g.* where the Black King goes over at once to the Queen's ſide,) but by all of them Black muſt loſe.

It would lead me too far, were I to preſent more games accompanied with full notes. Suffice it to repeat, that all of theſe games of Philidor's old age, taken from the Atwood MSS., contain ſuch overſights as, under other circumſtances, would rarely occur between good players. The games, moreover, taken all together—even when no odds are given (as in many of the blindfold-games)—are played entirely in the ſpirit of that Cheſs-period—that is to ſay, with that want of elegance and brilliancy—nay, with that *clumſineſs*—in planning the combinations, which then prevailed throughout the North of Europe.

During Philidor's laſt days, immediately preceding his death, his ſtrength in play muſt have fallen off conſiderably, for he gave lighter odds. Atwood had been accuſtomed to take the Queen's Knight, or the Queen's Rook, for the King's Biſhop's Pawn—on one occaſion, for the Queen's Biſhop's Pawn. He appears, however, as the winner, in the majority of thoſe games of Walker's *Selection*, that belong to the ſummer of 1795. And the change certainly was not on Atwood's ſide. He did not play particularly well—as may be ſeen by the following opening moves of a game, which bears date the 24th of

June, 1795, preciſely two months, therefore, before Philidor's death:—(Philidor gives QR for KBP, and has the move)—1. KP2, KP1; 2. QP2, QP2; 3. KP on, QBP2; 4. QBP1, P:P; 5. P:P, KB†; 6. K K2, QKt P1; 7. Q QR4†, QKt Q2; 8. Q:B, B QR3†; 9. K K, B:B; 10. K:B, QR QB; 11. QKt B3, Q KR5; &c. The game has become reaſonably equal, conſidering that the firſt player had given the Rook; but Philidor loſt it, at laſt, for no other reaſon, than becauſe he failed to ſeize the initiative in the later combinations. On the 28th and 29th of June, he gave Atwood only the Pawn and Two Moves, in games, which were perhaps the laſt he ever played: theſe games he won. In January 1796, Verdoni gave the ſame Odds with ſucceſs to Atwood, after having failed in the attempt to give him the Knight. It would appear from this, that Verdoni—whom Sarratt, from perſonal acquaintance, deſignates, in his Treatiſe, (1808, p. xxii.,) as "inconteſtably a player of the firſt order"—may probably have favoured Atwood. If ſuch were not the caſe, then we might agree with Walker (1835, p. 74) in his inference, that "while the games of Verdoni evince unqueſtionable talents for invention, they prove the immeaſurable ſuperiority of Philidor." Verdoni died at London about the year 1804. As to what his real ſtrength was, in compariſon with that of Philidor, we happen to poſſeſs preciſe information. We learn, namely, from a letter of Deſchapelles to the late celebrated Aſtronomer, Schumacher of Altona, (printed in the *Berliner Schachzeitung* for 1848, pp. 274 and 327,) that Philidor did indeed give Verdoni the Pawn,

but that he reſerved to himſelf the Move. The difference of ſtrength thus indicated was ſo ſlight, that in our day no attempt would be made to equalize it by any kind of Odds.

But Walker does not ſtop with inferring the inferiority of Verdoni to Philidor: he croſſes the boundary of the eighteenth century, and, by aſſuming that Sarratt was exactly equal to Verdoni, eſtabliſhes a means of compariſon between the earlier and the later age, and comes to the concluſion, that Philidor would have proved decidedly ſuperior to the Cheſs-maſters of the preſent day. But this compariſon reſts on too uncertain a foundation. For, in the firſt place, as to the real ſtrength of Verdoni, Sarratt may have rated it too high;—ſince in his Treatiſe (1808, p. 6,) he intimates, that his relations to Verdoni were thoſe of a mere beginner to an adept.* Under ſuch circumſtances, the experienced player might well appear to him to be greater than he really was. In the next place, there is abſolutely nothing to go upon to prove that Sarratt ſtood upon the ſame level with Verdoni. I think myſelf authorized to ſay, that the aſſumption of ſuch equality is certainly erroneous. The later generation of Cheſs-players has not, indeed, ſhewn itſelf particularly grateful for the haſty labours of Sarratt as a Cheſs-

* From a letter of Mr. Lewis's to me, (as well as from Walker, *Selections*, p. 61, *note*,) it appears that Sarratt ſtood to Verdoni in the relation of a *Pupil* to a *Teacher*: "Verdoni" (he ſays) "was Sarratt's maſter, and was ſcarcely, if at all, inferior to Philidor, although he learned the game in middle age."—Tr.

author, although he really did good ſervice, between the publication of his *Treatiſe* in 1808 and his death in 1821, both by his own works and by his abridged tranſlations of the old Maſters; but even leſs juſtice appears to have been meted out to him as a Cheſs-*player*. Lewis—who in April 1821 had played with Deſchapelles and was acquainted with the other Maſters of that day—"aſſerts, without heſitation," of Sarratt, on the 30th of November, 1822, (in the Preface to his tranſlation of Carrera,) "that he was the fineſt and moſt finiſhed player he had ever ſeen, alike excellent in attack and defence."* According to this, the efforts of Sarratt in practical ſkill could not for a moment be put on the ſame level with the moderately well-played games of Verdoni in Walker's *Selection*. I abide, therefore, by the opinion, that the players of the ſecond half of the laſt century were inferior to the Cheſs-maſters of the more recent period. There can be no doubt, that the modern habit of making Cheſs a ſubject of theoretical ſtudy—whether by private reading, or by playing with ſkilful book-players—has contributed not a little to ſuch ſuperiority of our age over

* Mr. Lewis ſtill expreſſes the ſame opinion. I may without impropriety give his very words; for although they occur in a private letter, they are but the ſpecification of the general ſtatement made public in 1822. "If the perfection of Cheſs-playing" (he writes) "conſiſts in making the beſt moves with the greateſt rapidity, La Bourdonnais approached perfection nearer than any player I have ever known. I ſhould, however, have backed both Deſchapelles and SARRATT (both ſlow players) againſt him, thinking them a ſhade better." (*Letter* to G. A., March 5th, 1860.)—TR.

the paſt. The arduous labours of the Cheſs-author—in which I may claim to have had my ſhare—find their reward in the aſſurance, that they have been ſucceſsful in attaining the object they aimed at,—to raiſe the ſtandard and the character of actual play.

Another element, to aſſiſt in determining the ſtrength of Philidor, is furniſhed by a game, which was publiſhed by La Bourdonnais in the firſt volume of the *Palamède*, (1836,) p. 392. It was played by him againſt the "Amateurs," Carlier and Bernard. Deſchapelles knew them both, and ſays, that when playing ſingly with Philidor, they received from him the Pawn and Move; but that when they played againſt him conſulting, Philidor either loſt, at theſe odds, or ſucceeded with difficulty in drawing the game. The following game, which dates from the year 1780, muſt be the oldeſt recorded ſpecimen of a "Conſultation-game." Philidor gives KBP, and loſes by his own fault.—1. (Carlier and Bernard) KP2, (Philidor) KP1; 2. QP2, QP2; 3. P : P, P : P; 4. Q R5†, P covers; 5. Q K5†, Q covers; 6. QB KB4, QBP1; 7. KB K2, KB Kt2; 8. Q : Q†, Kt : Q; 9. KKt B3, Caſtles; 10. QB K5, QKt Q2; 11. Caſtles, QKt : B; 12. Kt : Kt. ("White retakes with the Knight," ſays the *Palamède*, "in order to enable KBP afterwards to ſupport the Knight." We ſhall, however, preſently ſee, that both parties, for ſeveral moves, failed in forming a correct judgment of the poſition, which really gave Black a chance to win back his Pawn. The queſtion, whether the Pawn would have been loſt juſt as well, if White had played 12. *P : P*, I do not pauſe to examine thoroughly: appa-

rently, the Pawn might in that caſe have been ſafe.) B: Kt; 13. P: B, KR B5. (The Rook goes one ſquare too far: it ſhould have ſtopt at *B4*. In that caſe, White's paſſed Pawn would have been loſt. For the game muſt then have proceeded thus: 14. *KBP2, KKtP* on; 15. *P: P, R: BP*, and KP cannot be ſaved. This combination was obſerved, neither by the parties nor by the *Palamède*, which aſcribes the loſs of the game by Philidor to the fact, that Black, by 12. *B: Kt*, allowed White to get a paſſed Pawn.) 14. KB Q3, QB KB4; 15. B: B, Kt: B. (Philidor's moves lead, in the ſimpleſt poſſible way, to his defeat. It is difficult to ſee why he did not contrive to adopt another line of play. He ſtill had it in his power to take off the paſſed Pawn: *e. g.* 15. . . . *R: B*; 16. *KBP2, KKtP* on; 17. *P: P, R: BP*. The game might then have proceeded ſomewhat as follows: 18. *R K, Kt Kt3*; 19. *KP* on, *R K4*; 20. *Kt Q2, QR K*, and Black wins the Pawn without danger.) 16. KKtP1, KR K5; 17. KBP2, KR K7; 18. QKt R3, Kt K6; 19. KR B2, R: R; 20. K: R, Kt KKt5†; 21. K Kt2, QR Q; 22. KRP1, Kt KR3; 23. KKtP on, QRP1; 24. QR Q, Kt KB2; 25. KRP on, QBP on; 26. QBP1, QKtP2; 27. Kt QB2, QRP1; 28. Kt K3, QP on; 29. P: P, P: P; 30. Kt QB2, QP on; 31. Kt K, QP on; 32. Kt KB3 and wins. This game appears to me to be well calculated to confirm the opinion, which I have before expreſſed, concerning the Cheſs-ſkill of Philidor and his contemporaries.

I cloſe this diſcuſſion, by paſſing in review the ſucceſſion of great players, who have figured during the lateſt

period of Chefs-hiftory. The lift begins with M. de Kermuy, Sire de Légal. He attained to a very advanced old age—to nearly ninety years. He was the teacher of Philidor; but it was fettled, by the match of 1755, that the maſter was decidedly inferior to his pupil. Up to the time of his death, however, Légal maintained his rank as the ſecond player of France. Philidor was the firſt up to 1795. Of the ſame period, and aſſociated with him, were the Syrian Stamma, the ſo-called *Amateurs*, Léger, Carlier, and Bernard, and eſpecially Verdoni. The contemporary Italians, Rio, Ponziani, and Lolli did not come into contact with the Chefs-maſters of Paris and London. We know nothing of any Spaniſh players of that period. The annals of Chefs ſay as little of any contemporary German celebrities. Count Brühl, to be ſure, (1737–1809,) nephew of the Saxon Miniſter, ſo celebrated in the time of Frederic the Great, a German, but reſident in England for the greater part of his life, is named among the beſt of the Engliſh players. Like them, however, he was decidedly inferior to Philidor. The tranſition from the laſt to the preſent century is formed by Verdoni, Carlier, and Bernard. With theſe players, whoſe celebrity dated from the former period, the earlieſt heroes of this century, Sarratt and Deſchapelles were acquainted. To the ſame claſs we ſhould, perhaps, refer Hypolite du Bourblanc, who periſhed by ſhipwreck in 1813. Sarratt, who had been on terms of "intimate and uninterrupted friendſhip" with him ſince 1798, mentions, (1821, vol. i. p. 29,) that his "remarkable genius and *brilliancy* of attack" were ſaid to be re-

produced in the ſtyle of "the celebrated *Guillaume le Prêton*" (meaning Deſchapelles.) In Germany, Allgaier croſſes the boundary-line of the two centuries. Next after him, about the year 1820, comes Mendheim, of Berlin. Neither of theſe eminent players ever meaſured their ſtrength with each other or with any of the foreign celebrities. Of Sarratt alſo no matches are known; and, in like manner, the firſt of the Ruſſian great names, Petroff, has never—from the year 1824 to the preſent moment—come into contact with the Weſt. It is only during the very laſt years, that America has begun to be heard from in the world of Cheſs.

In France, Le Breton Deſchapelles ranked for a long time as the firſt player. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf, in 1821, againſt La Bourdonnais and Cochrane. During the ſame year, he gave the odds of the Pawn and Move, in three games, to Mr. Lewis, but without ſucceſs. Theſe three games were firſt made public by Greenwood Walker, in 1836, from the original minutes of the Engliſh player. Mr. Lewis, however, has informed me, very lately,* that in writing down the games from memory, he had, unfortunately, tranſpoſed ſome of the moves in one of them. It is from this game, that the Poſition is taken, which is diſcuſſed in the *Schachzeitung* for 1855, (p. 17.) It was expected, that a ſecond match would have been conteſted between Lewis and Deſchapelles, in 1836; but the negotiation was ultimately

* A part of the only day (March 8th, 1858) ſpent by the author in London, on his way to Rio Janeiro, was devoted to paying a viſit to Mr. Lewis.—Tr.

broken off. Since that time the death of the French player has occurred, and the Engliſh maſter has withdrawn entirely from the practice of the game. The two celebrated pupils of theſe great players reſpectively—La Bourdonnais, who was at the height of his fame in 1836, and M'Donnell—were prematurely loſt to Chefs, by death, before their maſters. We retain at the preſent moment, therefore, only one great living witneſs of the period, that has juſt paſſed away.

The links, ſtill untold, in the chain of my enumeration, are the players of the two laſt decades of years, of whom ſome are now dead, ſome ſtill on the ſtage. Their names are too well known to need recital by me.

APPENDIX.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

P. 4. Note *. See eſpecially the article *Des Maîtriſes* in a recent work, *La Muſique à l'Egliſe par M. J. d'Ortigue.* Paris 1861. "Elles [les Maîtriſes] les renvoyaient à l'abri du foyer domeſtique . . . . pourvus d'une éducation le plus ſouvent ſupérieure à celle des populations au milieu deſquelles ils vivaient, et qui leur permettait de trouver de ſuffiſants moyens d'exiſtence dans l'exercice de quelque profeſſion honorable." (P. 85.)

P. 12. *Philidor himſelf was living abroad at the time.* So I inferred from Twiſs's citation from the *Encyclopédie;* but he had left out the cloſing words of the article, viz., *Il eſt maintenant à Paris,* which, however, have the appearance of being added after the body of the article had been written.

P. 21. Philidor undoubtedly went with Lanza as a *Singer.* I find, in the *Mercure français* for May 1770, that he ſung one of his own *Motetts* in a *Concert Spirituel* of that year.

P. 29. My friend, Mr. William R. Henry—whoſe knowledge of problem-literature is abſolutely exhauſtive—has pointed out to me an earlier *Spieſſruthenſpiel,* than Don Pietro Petronio's, in Gianutio (1597) f. 48, Ottavo partito *ſuttiliſſimo di dieci tratti.*

P. 36. Theſe important facts (unknown even to Twiſs) are given by Gerber upon better authority than mere goſſip and tradition: he found them in the *Almanachs* and other authentic printed documents of the day. This I learn from my friend Mr. Thayer, (now in Vienna,)

who has had occaſion to collect and uſe the ſame documents for the Life of Beethoven, to which he has already devoted ſo many years of ſtudy and preparation.—In eſtimating Philidor's pecuniary reſources, (p. 89,) I neglected to mention the fact, that—beſides being a penſioner of Louis XV.—he was alſo *Maître de Chapelle* to the Duke of Deux Ponts, an appointment to which, undoubtedly, ſome ſalary was attached. This fact alſo reſts upon the ſole authority of Gerber; but we have ſeen that he is careful to "ſpeak by the card;" and he is ſuſtained (to ſome extent) by Philidor's dedication of his *Tom Jones* to *S. A. S. Monſeigneur le Duc Régnant des Deux Ponts, Prince Palatin du Rhin, Duc de Bavière, &c., &c.*

P. 58. Note. The career of a grandſon of Philidor's—Alphonſe, a violiniſt and pupil of Baillot—is beautifully traced by M. Scudo, in the ſecond volume of his *Critique et Littérature Muſicales.*

Pp. 66–8. I have made ſad work, in my text, with the relations of Philidor and Gluck, becauſe the authorities, on which I was forced to rely, were all bent on being wrong in ſome way: Fétis, in particular, who, in the ſubſtance of his defence, is certainly right, is inexcuſably wrong in ſome of the details; and Sévelinges, who is eſſentially and wickedly wrong, in the gift and *animus* of his accuſation, is, after all, right where Fétis is wrong. Now that I have the help of the original authority, Favart, I will try to put theſe matters to rights here.—A year *before* the repreſentation of Philidor's *Sorcier*—viz., early in 1763—Gluck's friend, Count Durazzo, ſent the ſcore of the *Orfeo* to his correſpondent, Favart, to have it engraved in Paris. Favart applied to Duni to correct the proofs. This Duni poſitively refuſed to do, on any terms; becauſe, on examining the "copy," he found it full of errors, which he would not take the reſponſibility or the trouble of correcting. At length, on the 19th of April, Favart writes to the Count:—"I have had the ſcore ſhown to Philidor, and he does not prove by any means ſo hard to deal with as the reſt. He offers to make the preliminary corrections of the ſcore *gratis*, and to ſuperintend the engraving in perſon. He aſks nothing of your Excellency but a copy of the work. While reading the ſcore, at ſeveral places, he was affected to tears. He always held the talents of the Chevalier Gluck

in high eſteem; but now that he has come to know the *Orfeo*, his eſteem has riſen to veneration." (*Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 102.)—André Philidor is, therefore, wrong: it was the engraving, and not the repreſentation, of the *Orfeo*, (before it became the *Orphée*,) which his father ſuperintended. Sévelinges is wrong (and, judging by the ſpirit of his article, calumniouſly wrong) in charging, that Philidor ſtole from the *Orfeo*, note for note, the romance, *Objet de mon amour*. Fétis is right in refuting this charge of plagiariſm by appealing to an inſpection of the two ſcores, and thus demonſtrating that the *corpus delicti* was a nonentity; but he is wrong, in turn, when he ſays, that Philidor could not have known the *Orfeo* in ſeaſon to commit the theft. He is wrong, moreover, in ſaying, that Sévelinges charged Philidor with the plagiariſm on the authority of Favart: Sévelinges merely cites Favart to ſhow, that Philidor had in his hands the ſcore of the *Orfeo* while at work on his own *Sorcier*.* Fétis is alſo wrong, in ſo far as he creates the impreſſion, that Favart regarded Philidor as a plagiariſt: Favart uniformly expreſſes himſelf as the friend and admirer of Philidor. And, finally, Fétis is careleſſly wrong in ſaying, (as he does, in his ſecond edition,) that it was Duni who ſuperintended the engraving of the *Orfeo*.

P. 70. Note. More than this—Mr. Fiſke has ſhown (*Chefs Monthly* for January 1861,) that Count Brühl went to Paris in September 1755, (a year after Philidor's return home,) and lived there, as an *attaché* of the Saxon embaſſy, until March 1759. The "laſt viſit" was probably that which he made (according to Mr. Fiſke) in 1785.

P. 74. I have fortunately diſinterred, from the *Mercure français* for Auguſt 1771, the original Proſpectus of Philidor's Second Edition. Conſidering the date, it becomes highly probable, that Philidor's trip

---

* Fétis would have done better ſervice, if he had driven his ſtake through Sévelinges, as a logical *felo de ſe*: the ſhortſighted *advocatus diaboli* proves, namely, that Philidor muſt certainly have committed the alleged theft, by proving that Philidor had, ſix months before, put it in the power of every muſician and muſical critic in Paris to make inſtant detection and expoſure of the theft.

to England in 1772 was made (under the encouragement of Count Brühl and other friends) for the ſpecial purpoſe of obtaining ſubſcribers to his book, and that a part of the liſt was formed before the Cheſs-Club was organized, and the final arrangement made for his annual viſit.

P. 75. Note †. Of courſe, I baſed my argument upon the belief, that "notre milord Goy" was fairly equal to "our Engliſh friend, Goy," who—being, in French parlance, a *milord anglais*—might be a Peer, and could not be leſs than a gentleman. I knew not whether to be more amazed or amuſed, when I ſtumbled upon the evidence, in Walckenaer's *Vie d'Horace*, (t. i. p. 383,) that "mylord Goy" was the *ſobriquet* of a remarkable French *farceur*—an *obligato* appendage of the higheſt Pariſian ſociety—of whom Favart (t. ii. p. 239) tells a ſtrange anecdote. But ſuch men take the beſt care of themſelves—when they have money; and my argument may ſtill, perhaps, be as ſound as ever.